

Robust estimates for elliptic nonlocal operators on doubling spaces

Soobin Cho¹

¹Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign,
Urbana, IL 61801, USA. Email: soobinc@illinois.edu

Abstract

We study weak Harnack inequality and a priori Hölder regularity of harmonic functions for symmetric nonlocal Dirichlet forms on metric measure spaces with volume doubling condition. Our analysis relies on three main assumptions: the existence of a strongly local Dirichlet form with sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimates, a tail estimate of the jump measure outside balls and a local energy comparability condition. We establish the robustness of our results, ensuring that the constants in our estimates remain bounded, provided that the order of the scale function appearing in the tail estimate and local energy comparability condition, maintains a certain distance from zero. Additionally, we establish a sufficient condition for the local energy comparability condition.

Keywords: Nonlocal Dirichlet form, metric measure space, Hölder regularity estimates, weak Harnack inequality.

MSC 2020: Primary 31E05, 35B05, 35B35; Secondary 28A80, 60J76

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction and Main results | 2 |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 2 |
| 1.2 | Main result | 2 |
| 2 | Analysis of subordinate processes | 9 |
| 2.1 | Analysis of the subordinator ξ^s | 10 |
| 2.2 | Analysis of the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$ | 13 |
| 3 | Robust function inequalities under $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ | 21 |
| 4 | L^2-mean value inequality for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ | 29 |
| 5 | Regularity estimates for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ | 34 |
| 5.1 | $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s) + \text{rFK}_\beta(s) + \text{rCS}_\beta(s) + \text{rPI}_\beta(s) \Rightarrow \text{rWEHI}_\beta(s)$ | 34 |
| 5.2 | $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s) + \text{rWEHI}_\beta(s) \Rightarrow \text{rEHR}_\beta(s)$ | 38 |
| 6 | Proof of Theorem 1.14 | 41 |

1 Introduction and Main results

1.1 Introduction

Regularity results for nonlocal Dirichlet forms are of significant importance in both analysis and probability theory. Extensive studies have been dedicated to this area. See, for example, [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 23, 38, 48, 51]. A typical example of a nonlocal regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on a metric measure (M, d, μ) is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) = \int_{M \times M} (f(x) - f(y))(g(x) - g(y))J(x, y)\mu(dx)\mu(dy), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F},$$

where $J(x, y)$ is a symmetric measurable function on $M \times M$ satisfying

$$\frac{C^{-1}}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \leq J(x, y) \leq \frac{C}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in M, \quad (1.1)$$

with $C > 1$ and $s \in (0, 1)$. Here $\beta \geq 2$ represents the *walk dimension* of M . This includes the Dirichlet form associated with the fractional Laplacian $-(-\Delta)^s$ on \mathbb{R}^d . Notably, while the walk dimension of the Euclidean space is 2, many fractals are known to have the walk dimension $\beta > 2$, potentially resulting in βs exceeding 2.

When $\beta s > 2$, a significant challenge in obtaining regularity estimates arises due to the fact that the domain of the Dirichlet form may not include all Lipschitz functions. This necessitates careful construction of cutoff test functions a priori to obtain the desired regularity estimates. This issue was independently addressed by introducing cutoff Sobolev inequality and generalized capacity condition in [21, 20, 18] and [29], respectively. However, verifying these conditions is challenging without the two-sided pointwise bounds (1.1) for the density of the jump kernel, except in cases such as when (M, d) is an ultra-metric space (see [9]), where the domain of the Dirichlet form includes all characteristic functions on open balls.

In this work, we deal with metric measure spaces with the walk dimension $\beta \geq 2$. The paper is divided into two parts. In the first part, we introduce the local energy comparability condition $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ (see Definition 1.3(ii) below) and show that it implies robust versions of fractional Poincaré inequality, Faber-Krahn inequality and cutoff Sobolev inequality on metric measure spaces, under the tail estimate of the jump measure outside balls $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ (see Definition 1.3(i)). The condition $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ is easier to verify compared to the cutoff Sobolev inequality or the generalized capacity condition, especially when $\beta s \geq 2$. We provide a sufficient condition for $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ that applies to degenerate jump kernels, extending the work of [15]. To the best of our knowledge, for $\beta s \geq 2$, this result gives the first general verification of the cutoff Sobolev inequality for nonlocal operators with degenerate jump kernels, except when (M, d) is an ultrametric space.

In the second part, by adapting recent techniques from [18, 20, 21, 29], we establish robust weak Harnack inequality and a priori Hölder regularity for harmonic functions of nonlocal Dirichlet forms, ensuring that the constants in these estimates remain bounded as s approaches 1. While robust results have been established for nonlocal operators on Euclidean spaces (e.g., [14, 25, 24, 34]), we extend this approach to general metric measure spaces.

1.2 Main result

Let (M, d) be a locally compact separable metric space and μ be a Radon measure on M with full support. The triple (M, d, μ) is referred to as a *metric measure space*. For $p \in [1, \infty]$, denote by $L^p(M)$ the L^p -space $L^p(M; \mu)$, and by $\|\cdot\|_p$ the norm in $L^p(M)$. The inner product in $L^2(M)$ will be denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. For $x \in M$ and $r > 0$, we use $B(x, r)$ to denote the open ball of radius r centered at x , and $V(x, r)$ for $\mu(B(x, r))$. Set

$$\overline{R} := \text{diam}(M) \in (0, \infty].$$

Throughout this paper, we assume that all open balls in M are relatively compact and *there exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 1$ such that*

$$\frac{V(x, R)}{V(x, r)} \leq C \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^\alpha \quad \text{for all } x \in M \text{ and } 0 < r \leq R. \quad (\text{VD})$$

Condition VD is known as the *volume doubling property*. Note that VD is equivalent to the following condition:

$$\frac{V(y, R)}{V(x, r)} \leq C \left(\frac{R + d(x, y)}{r} \right)^\alpha \quad \text{for all } x, y \in M \text{ and } 0 < r \leq R. \quad (\text{VD}^*)$$

Let $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}] \times \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-negative definite symmetric bilinear form where $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$ is a dense subspace of $L^2(M)$. For $\lambda > 0$, define $\mathcal{C}_\lambda(f, g) = \mathcal{C}(f, g) + \lambda \langle f, g \rangle$. The symmetric form $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$ is called a *Dirichlet form* on $L^2(M)$, if (i) $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$ is a Hilbert space with respect to the inner product \mathcal{C}_1 and (ii) for any $f \in \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$, $f_+ \wedge 1 \in \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$ and $\mathcal{C}(f_+ \wedge 1, f_+ \wedge 1) \leq \mathcal{C}(f, f)$. The Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$ is called *regular* if $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}] \cap C_c(M)$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$ with \mathcal{C}_1 -norm and dense in $C_c(M)$ with the sup-norm, where $C_c(M)$ denotes the space of all continuous functions on M with compact supports. For a given regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$, it is known that each function $f \in \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$ admits a quasi-continuous version \tilde{f} on M (see [27, Theorem 2.1.3]). In this paper, whenever referring to a regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$, we always consider a quasi-continuous version of $f \in \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$, which we denote as f without further explicit indication.

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$ be a regular Dirichlet form. The generator $\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{C}$ of $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$ is defined by a self-adjoint non-positive definite operator in $L^2(M)$ whose $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{C})$ consists of exactly those $f \in \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$ that there is unique $u \in L^2(M)$ so that

$$\mathcal{C}(f, g) = -\langle u, g \rangle \quad \text{for all } g \in \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}],$$

and $\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{C} f = u$. Let $(P_t^\mathcal{C})_{t \geq 0}$ be the associated semigroup for $\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{C}$. Then $(P_t^\mathcal{C})_{t \geq 0}$ defines a contraction semigroup on $L^p(M)$ for every $p \in [1, \infty]$. By general theory (see [27]), there exists a μ -symmetric Hunt process $Z^\mathcal{C} = \{Z_t^\mathcal{C}, t \geq 0; \mathbb{P}^x, x \in M \setminus \mathcal{N}\}$ associated with $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$, where \mathcal{N} is a properly exceptional set, in the following sense: For any $p \in [1, \infty]$ and any Borel function $f \in L^p(M)$,

$$P_t^\mathcal{C} f(x) = \mathbb{E}^x[f(Z_t^\mathcal{C})] \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in M.$$

A Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$ is called *strongly local*, if $\mathcal{C}(f, g) = 0$ for all $f, g \in \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}]$ such that f has a compact support and g is constant in a neighborhood of $\text{supp}[f]$. The form $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}])$ is called *conservative* if $P_t^\mathcal{C} \mathbf{1}_M = \mathbf{1}_M$ for all $t > 0$.

Let $\beta > 1$. We say that (M, d, μ) satisfies condition $\text{Exi}(\beta)$ with the walk dimension β , if there exists a conservative strongly local Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^L, \mathcal{F}^L)$ on $L^2(M)$ that has a jointly measurable heat kernel q with the following estimate: There exist constants $\eta \in (0, 1/2)$, $c_i > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, such that for all $t > 0$ and μ -a.e. $x, y \in M$,

$$\frac{c_1}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} \mathbf{1}_{\{d(x, y) \leq \eta t^{1/\beta}\}} \leq q(t, x, y) \leq \frac{c_2}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} \exp \left(-c_3 \left(\frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{t} \right)^{1/(\beta-1)} \right). \quad (1.2)$$

Example 1.1. The Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d satisfies $\text{Exi}(2)$ with $\mathcal{E}^L(f, f) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f|^2 dx$. If M is a geodesically complete Riemannian manifold and the Ricci curvature of M is non-negative, then $\text{Exi}(2)$ is satisfied. We refer to [28, 43, 49]. Moreover, many fractals including the Vicsek set, the d -dimensional Sierpiński gasket and Sierpiński triangle satisfy $\text{Exi}(\beta)$ for some $\beta > 2$. See, for example, [2, 3, 26, 39, 40] and references therein.

Many studies have explored the equivalent characterization of (1.2) using Harnack inequality and functional inequalities such as Poicaré and cutoff Sobolev inequalities, and the generalized capacity condition for strongly local Dirichlet forms. See, for example, [1, 4, 5, 32, 33].

We recall the following consequences of condition $\text{Exi}(\beta)$ from [37, Theorem 4.5 and Lemma 4.7] and [5, Theorem 3.1].

Proposition 1.2. *Suppose that $\text{Exi}(\beta)$ holds for $\beta > 1$. Then $\beta \geq 2$ and the following reverse volume doubling property holds: There exist constants $C > 1$ and $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{V(x, R)}{V(x, r)} \geq C^{-1} \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^{\alpha_0} \quad \text{for all } x \in M \text{ and } 0 < r \leq R < \bar{R}. \quad (\text{RVD})$$

Moreover, the heat kernel $q(t, x, y)$ can be chosen to be jointly continuous on $(0, \infty) \times M \times M$ and the μ -symmetric Hunt process $Z = \{Z_t, t \geq 0; \mathbb{P}^x, x \in M\}$ associated with $(\mathcal{E}^L, \mathcal{F}^L)$ can be modified to start from every point in M .

Condition $\text{Exi}(\beta)$ will be in force throughout this paper.

This assumption allows us to construct a specific class of nonlocal Dirichlet forms through subordination, which in turn facilitates the establishment of a priori robust function inequalities. By Proposition 1.2, we have $\beta \geq 2$ and (M, d, μ) satisfies RVD with $\alpha_0 \in (0, \alpha]$, where α is the constant in VD. Further, the process Z associated with $(\mathcal{E}^L, \mathcal{F}^L)$ has a jointly continuous heat kernel $q(t, x, y)$ and can start from any point in M .

We consider a nonlocal bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(M)$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(f, g) &= \int_{M \times M} (f(x) - f(y))(g(x) - g(y))J(dx, dy), \\ \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{E}_1\text{-closure of } \{f \in C_c(M) : \mathcal{E}(f, f) < \infty\}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where $J(dx, dy)$ is a symmetric Borel measure on $M \times M$. Denote by $\mathcal{B}(M)$ the σ -algebra of all Borel sets of M . We assume that there exists $J : M \times \mathcal{B}(M) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following properties:

- (1) For every $x \in M$, $J(x, \cdot)$ is a Borel measure.
- (2) For every $E \in \mathcal{B}(M)$, the map $x \mapsto J(x, E)$ is a Borel function on M .
- (3) $J(dx, dy) = J(x, dy)\mu(dx)$ in $M \times M$.

To state our results precisely, we introduce several conditions for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. From now on, we fix constants $R_0 \in (0, \bar{R})$ and $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, and denote a constant as ‘independent of $s \in [s_0, 1]$ ’, if it may rely on s_0 but remains unaffected by the particular value of s .

Definition 1.3. Let $s \in [s_0, 1)$.

(i) We say that \mathcal{E} satisfies the *robust tail estimate condition* $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s) = \text{rTJ}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$ if there exists a constant $\Lambda > 0$ independent of s such that for all $x \in M$ and $r \in (0, R_0)$,

$$J(x, B(x, r)^c) \leq \frac{\Lambda(1-s)}{r^{\beta s}}.$$

(ii) We say that \mathcal{E} satisfies the *robust energy comparability condition* $\text{rEC}_\beta(s) = \text{rEC}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$ if there exist constants $C, K_0 \geq 1$ independent of s such that for all $x_0 \in M$, $r \in (0, R_0)$ and $f \in L^2(B(x_0, r))$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, r) \times B(x_0, r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \geq C^{-1}(1-s) \int_{B(x_0, r/K_0) \times B(x_0, r/K_0)} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy). \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

Remark 1.4. (i) If $J(dx, dy)$ has a density $J(x, y)$ with respect to $\mu \times \mu$ and there exists $C \geq 1$ independent of s such that

$$\frac{C^{-1}(1-s)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \leq J(x, y) \leq \frac{C(1-s)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in M,$$

then $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ hold.

(ii) The opposite direction for (1.4) holds under $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$. See Proposition 3.2 below.

(iii) Condition $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ is motivated by condition (A) in [24], where robust estimates in the Euclidean space were established. For general criteria and examples of nonlocal Dirichlet forms on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ (with $K_0 = 1$), we refer to [13, 24]. Our novelty is allowing the constant K_0 to be strictly larger than 1. This makes it possible to verify $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ using a more accessible non-degeneracy condition. Refer to [15, (1.4)] for the Euclidean space case and Theorem 1.14 for its generalization to general metric measure spaces.

For an open set $U \subset M$ with positive measure and $f \in L^1(U)$, we let

$$\bar{f}_U := \frac{1}{\mu(U)} \int_U f d\mu.$$

Definition 1.5. Let $s \in [s_0, 1)$. We say that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies the *robust Poincaré inequality* $\text{rPI}_\beta(s) = \text{rPI}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$, if there exist constants $C > 0$ and $K_1 \geq 1$ independent of s such that for any $x_0 \in M$, $0 < r < R_0/K_1$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\int_{B(x_0, r)} (f - \bar{f}_{B(x_0, r)})^2 d\mu \leq Cr^{\beta s} \int_{B(x_0, K_1 r) \times B(x_0, K_1 r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy).$$

For a non-empty open set $D \subset M$, let \mathcal{F}_D be the closure of $\mathcal{F} \cap C_c(D)$ in \mathcal{F} with respect to the \mathcal{E}_1 -norm. The form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}_D)$ is called the *part of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on D* . It is known that if $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(M)$, then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}_D)$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(D)$ (see [27, Theorem 4.4.3]).

Definition 1.6. Let $s \in [s_0, 1)$. We say that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies the *robust Faber-Krahn inequality* $\text{rFK}_\beta(s) = \text{rFK}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$, if there exist constants $C > 0$ and $K_2 \geq 1$ independent of s such that for any $x_0 \in M$, $0 < r < R_0/K_2$, non-empty open set $D \subset B(x_0, r)$ and any $f \in \mathcal{F}_D$ with $\|f\|_2 = 1$,

$$\left(\frac{V(x_0, r)}{\mu(D)} \right)^{\beta s / \alpha} \leq C \left(r^{\beta s} \int_{B(x_0, K_2 r) \times B(x_0, K_2 r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + 1 \right). \quad (1.5)$$

Note that we use a local energy term incremented by 1 on the right-hand side of (1.5), differing from the typical use of $r^{\beta s} \mathcal{E}(f, f)$ in previous works.

For open subsets U and V of M , the notation $U \Subset V$ means that $\bar{U} \subset V$.

Definition 1.7. Let U and V be open sets of M with $U \Subset V$ and $\kappa \geq 1$. We say that a measurable function φ on M is a κ -*cutoff function* for $U \Subset V$, if $0 \leq \varphi \leq \kappa$ in M , $\varphi \geq 1$ in U and $\varphi = 0$ in V^c . Any 1-cutoff function is simply referred to as a *cutoff function*.

Denote $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} := \{u + a : u \in \mathcal{F}, a \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b := \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \cap L^\infty(M)$. Since \mathcal{E} has no killing part, we can extend the form \mathcal{E} from \mathcal{F} to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ by letting

$$\mathcal{E}(u + a, v + b) := \mathcal{E}(u, v), \quad \text{for all } u, v \in \mathcal{F}, a, b \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Definition 1.8. Let $s \in [s_0, 1)$. We say that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies the *robust cutoff Sobolev inequality* $\text{rCS}_\beta(s) = \text{rCS}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$, if for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ independent of s such that the following holds: For any $x_0 \in M$ and $R, r > 0$ with $R + 2r < R_0$, there exists a cutoff function $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ for $B(x_0, R) \Subset B(x_0, R + r)$ such that for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, R+2r) \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq \varepsilon \int_{B(x_0, R+r) \times B(x_0, R+2r)} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{C}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{B(x_0, R+2r)} f^2 d\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

For $s \in (0, 1)$, define a Sobolev-Slobodeckij space $W^{\beta s/2, 2}(M)$ by

$$W^{\beta s/2, 2}(M) := \left\{ u \in L^2(M) : \int_{M \times M} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) < \infty \right\}. \quad (1.7)$$

Our first main result is the following theorem. The proof of this theorem will be given at the end of Section 3.

Theorem 1.9. Suppose that VD and Exi(β) hold. Let $R_0 \in (0, \bar{R})$ and $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given constants, and $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a bilinear form on $L^2(M)$ given by (1.3). If $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies $\text{rTJ}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$ for some $s \in [s_0, 1)$, then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(M)$ and $\mathcal{F} = W^{\beta s/2, 2}(M)$. Moreover, $\text{rFK}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$, $\text{rCS}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$ and $\text{rPI}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$ hold for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.

For an open set $D \subset M$, we say that a Borel function u is locally in \mathcal{F}_D , denoted as $u \in \mathcal{F}_D^{\text{loc}}$, if for any relatively compact open set $U \Subset D$, there exists $f \in \mathcal{F}_D$ such that $u = f$ a.e. on U .

Let \mathcal{L} be the generator of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.

Definition 1.10. Let $D \subset M$ be a non-empty open subset and $f \in L^1(D)$. We say that $u \in \mathcal{F}_D^{\text{loc}}$ is a weak solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) of

$$-\mathcal{L}u = f \quad \text{in } D, \quad (1.8)$$

if u is locally bounded on D and satisfies the following two properties:

- (1) For any relatively compact open subset U and V of D with $U \Subset V \Subset D$,

$$\int_{U \times V^c} |u(y)| J(dx, dy) < \infty. \quad (1.9)$$

- (2) For any non-negative $\phi \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_c(D)$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}(u, \phi) = \langle f, \phi \rangle \quad (\text{resp. } \mathcal{E}(u, \phi) \leq \langle f, \phi \rangle, \mathcal{E}(u, \phi) \geq \langle f, \phi \rangle).$$

We use the notation “ $-\mathcal{L}u = f$ in D ” (resp. “ $-\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in D ”, “ $-\mathcal{L}u \geq f$ in D ”) to denote that u is a weak solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) to (1.8). We say that u is \mathcal{E} -harmonic in D if $-\mathcal{L}u = 0$ in D .

For Borel subsets D_1 and D_2 of M with $\text{dist}(D_1, D_2) > 0$ and a Borel function u on D_2 , we define a nonlocal tail $\mathcal{T}(u, D_1, D_2)$ of u by

$$\mathcal{T}(u, D_1, D_2) := \sup_{x \in D_1} \int_{D_2} |u(y)| J(x, dy). \quad (1.10)$$

Definition 1.11. Let $s \in [s_0, 1)$.

(i) We say that *robust weak elliptic Harnack inequality* $\text{rWEHI}_\beta(s) = \text{rWEHI}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$ holds for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, if there exist constants $\delta, C > 0$ and $K \geq 1$ independent of s such that for any $x_0 \in M$, $R \in (0, R_0)$, $r \in (0, R/(K+2))$, and any Borel function u that is bounded, non-negative and $-\mathcal{L}u \geq f$ in $B(x_0, R)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{V(x_0, r)} \int_{B(x_0, r)} u^\delta d\mu \right)^{1/\delta} \\ & \leq C \left[\text{ess inf}_{B(x_0, r)} u + r^{\beta s} \left(\mathcal{T}(u_-, B(x_0, Kr), B(x_0, R-2r)^c) + \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) We say that *elliptic Hölder regularity* $\text{rEHR}_\beta(s) = \text{rEHR}_\beta(R_0, s_0, s)$ holds for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, if there exist constants $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $C > 0$ independent of s such that for any $x_0 \in M$, $R \in (0, R_0)$ and any Borel function u that is bounded in M and \mathcal{E} -harmonic in $B(x_0, R)$,

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq C \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{R} \right)^\gamma \|u\|_\infty \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x, y \in B(x_0, R/4).$$

Our second main result is the following theorem. Using arguments developed in [21, 20, 18] and [29], we obtain regularity results for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ under $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$. Notably, our result allows the constants to remain independent of s as $s \rightarrow 1$, which was not addressed in the aforementioned works. The proof of this theorem will be presented at the end of Section 5.

Theorem 1.12. Suppose that VD and $\text{Exi}(\beta)$ hold. Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a bilinear form on $L^2(M)$ given by (1.3). For any fixed $R_0 \in (0, \overline{R})$ and $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, the following implications hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rTJ}_\beta(s) + \text{rEC}_\beta(s) & \Rightarrow \text{rTJ}_\beta(s) + \text{rFK}_\beta(s) + \text{rCS}_\beta(s) + \text{rPI}_\beta(s) + (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \text{ is regular} \\ & \Rightarrow \text{rTJ}_\beta(s) + \text{rWEHI}_\beta(s) \\ & \Rightarrow \text{rEHR}_\beta(s). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.13. For $s \in (0, 1)$, consider the quadratic form

$$\mathcal{C}^{(s)}(f, g) = (1-s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))(g(x) - g(y))}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dx dy, \quad f, g \in W^{s,2}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where $W^{s,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the Sobolev space. The form $(\mathcal{C}^{(s)}, W^{s,2}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ satisfies $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$. Consequently, by Theorem 1.12, $(\mathcal{C}^{(s)}, W^{s,2}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ satisfies $\text{rPI}_\beta(s)$, $\text{rWEHI}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEHR}_\beta(s)$ (with $R_0 = \infty$). This conclusion reaffirms the robust fractional Poincaré inequality on \mathbb{R}^d , which follows from the results of [11, 44, 45], and the robust weak Harnack inequality and elliptic Hölder regularity estimates for the fractional Laplacian, which were established in [24].

Lastly, we provide a sufficient condition for $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$, generalizing the main result of [15] for the Euclidean case.

Theorem 1.14. Let $s \in [s_0, 1)$. Suppose that VD holds and

$$\mu(\{y \in M : d(x, y) = r\}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in M \text{ and } r \in (0, R_0). \quad (1.11)$$

If $J(dx, dy)$ has a density $J(x, y)$ with respect to $\mu \times \mu$ and there exist constants $\delta_0, \sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta > 0$ such that for all $x \in M$, $r \in (0, R_0)$ and $y \in B(x, (1 + \delta_0)r)$,

$$\mu \left(\left\{ z \in B(y, r) : J(x, z) \geq \frac{\theta(1-s)}{V(x, d(x, z))d(x, z)^{\beta s}} \right\} \right) \geq \sigma V(y, r), \quad (1.12)$$

then $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ holds with C, K_0 depending on $s_0, \delta_0, \sigma, \theta$ and the constants C, α in VD only.

We say that (M, d, μ) satisfies *the annular decay property* if there exist constants $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $C > 1$ such that for all $x \in M$, $r > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mu(B(x, r) \setminus B(x, (1 - \varepsilon)r)) \leq C\varepsilon^\gamma V(x, r). \quad (1.13)$$

Remark 1.15. (i) The result of [15] is also robust with respect to the parameter s since the dependency on s occurs only through the constant c_b in [15, Definition 3.7], which has an upper bound in terms of s_0 .

(ii) If (M, d, μ) satisfies the annular decay property, then (1.11) follows directly. Moreover, by the proof of [15, Lemma 2.1], (1.12) is equivalent to that (1.12) holds for $y \in B(x, r)$ only, instead of $y \in B(x, (1 + \delta_0)r)$.

(iii) If (M, d) is a length space, then by [12, Corollary 2.2], (M, d, μ) satisfies the annular decay property.

(iv) Suppose that (M, d, μ) is complete and the heat kernel $q(t, x, y)$ in $\text{Exi}(\beta)$ satisfies the following lower bound in addition to (1.2): There exist $c_4, c_5 > 0$ such that

$$q(t, x, y) \geq \frac{c_4}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} \exp\left(-c_5\left(\frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{t}\right)^{1/(\beta-1)}\right) \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } \mu\text{-a.e. } x, y \in M.$$

Then, by [46, Corollary 1.8 and Remark 1.9(a)], there exists a geodesic metric \tilde{d} such that d and \tilde{d} are bi-Lipschitz equivalent. By replacing d with \tilde{d} , we have that (M, \tilde{d}, μ) is a length space and thus satisfies the annular decay property.

(v) In our setting, (M, d, μ) may not satisfy the annular decay property. For instance, let $M := \{(x, 0) : x < -1\} \cup \{(x, \sqrt{1-x^2}) : -1 \leq x \leq 0\} \cup \{(0, y) : -1 \leq y \leq 1\} \cup \{(x, -\sqrt{1-x^2}) : 0 \leq x \leq 1\} \cup \{(x, 0) : x \geq 1\}$, d be the metric inherited from \mathbb{R}^2 , and μ be the one-dimensional Hausdorff measure. Since d is comparable with the intrinsic metric on M , VD holds with $\alpha = 1$ and, by [43, Corollary 3.1 and Theorem 4.1], $\text{Exi}(2)$ holds. However, since $\mu(B(0, 1 + \varepsilon) - B(0, 1)) \geq \pi$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, (1.13) fails for any $\gamma \in (0, 1]$.

For the proof of Theorem 1.14, we mainly follow the strategy of [15]. However, significant non-trivial modifications are required since some of their arguments rely on the geodesic and annular decay properties of Euclidean space, which do not apply in our context. The proof of Theorem 1.14 will be provided in Section 6.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents robust estimates for subordinators and the Dirichlet forms associated with subordinate processes. In Sections 3 and 4, we establish $\text{rFK}_\beta(s)$, $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$, $\text{rPI}_\beta(s)$ and the L^2 -mean value inequality for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ under $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, by comparing $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with the one constructed in Section 2. In Section 5, we establish the weak Harnack inequality and Hölder regularity for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, thereby concluding the proof of Theorem 1.12. Section 6 contains the proof of Theorem 1.14.

Notation: We use α, α_0 for the constants in VD and RVD, and β, η for the constants in (1.2). We use the notations $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. For a subset D of M , the set D^c denotes its complement $M \setminus D$. Values of lower case letters with subscripts c_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ are fixed in each statement and proof, and the labeling of these constants starts anew in each proof. The notation $f(x) \asymp g(x)$ means that there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $c_1 g(x) \leq f(x) \leq c_2 g(x)$ in the common domain of the definition of f and g .

2 Analysis of subordinate processes

A C^∞ function ϕ on $(0, \infty)$ is called a *Bernstein function* if $(-1)^{n-1}\phi^{(n)}(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $\lambda > 0$. It is well known that every Bernstein function ϕ can be expressed as

$$\phi(\lambda) = a + b\lambda + \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-\lambda t})\Pi(dt),$$

where $a, b \geq 0$ are constants and Π is a Borel measure on $(0, \infty)$ satisfying $\int_0^\infty (1 \wedge t)\Pi(dt) < \infty$. The triplet (a, b, Π) is called the *Lévy triplet* of ϕ . A process $\xi = (\xi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is called a *subordinator*, if it is a real-valued non-decreasing Lévy process. For every subordinator ξ , there exists a unique Bernstein function ϕ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \xi_t}] = e^{-t\phi(\lambda)} \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0, t \geq 0.$$

The function ϕ is called the *Laplace exponent* of ξ . We refer to [50] for fundamental results on Bernstein functions and their connections to subordinators.

For $a \in [0, 1]$, we define a constant m_a by

$$m_a := \left(\frac{1 + \alpha/\beta}{1 - 2e^{-1}} \right)^{1-a}. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that

$$1 \leq m_a \leq m_0 \quad \text{for all } a \in [0, 1]. \quad (2.2)$$

Fix $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ and let $s \in [s_0, 1)$. Define a measure Π_s on $(0, \infty)$ by

$$\Pi_s(dt) := m_s(1-s)t^{-1-s}dt.$$

Observe that $\int_0^\infty (1 \wedge t)\Pi_s(dt) < \infty$. Let ϕ_s be the Bernstein function with the Lévy triplet $(0, 0, \Pi_s)$ and ξ^s be a subordinator corresponding to the Laplace exponent ϕ_s , independent of the process Z . Define a time-changed process $Y^s = (Y_t^s)_{t \geq 0}$ by

$$Y_t^s := Z_{\xi_t^s}, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.3)$$

According to [47, Theorem 2.1(ii)], Y^s is a Hunt process associated with a regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$. Moreover, by [47, Theorem 2.1(v)], we have

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f, g) = \int_{M \times M} (f(x) - f(y))(g(x) - g(y))J_s(x, y)\mu(dx)\mu(dy), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F}^s,$$

where

$$J_s(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty q(t, x, y)\Pi_s(dt). \quad (2.4)$$

Define a function q_s on $(0, \infty) \times M \times M$ by

$$q_s(t, x, y) := \int_0^\infty q(a, x, y)\mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \in da), \quad t > 0, x, y \in M. \quad (2.5)$$

From the definition (2.3) of Y^s , one can deduce that $q_s(t, x, y)$ is a heat kernel of $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$.

Recall that the Sobolev-Slobodeckij space $W^{\beta s/2, 2}(M)$ is defined as (1.7).

Proposition 2.1. $\mathcal{F}^s = W^{\beta s/2, 2}(M)$.

Proof. Let $(Q_t^s)_{t \geq 0}$ be the semigroup of $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$. By the general theory, we have

$$\mathcal{F}^s = \left\{ f \in L^2(M) : \sup_{t \in (0,1)} t^{-1} \langle f - Q_t^s f, f \rangle < \infty \right\}.$$

See, for example, [27, Lemma 1.3.4]. By the conservativeness and the symmetry of $(Q_t^s)_{t \geq 0}$, we have for all $f \in L^2(M)$ and $t > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{t} \langle f - Q_t^s f, f \rangle = \frac{1}{2t} \int_{M \times M} (f(x) - f(y))^2 q_s(t, x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy). \quad (2.6)$$

Following the arguments in the proof of [10, Theorem 3.1] (where M is assumed to be a unbounded d -set), one can deduce that $q_s(t, x, y)$ satisfies the following estimate:

$$q_s(t, x, y) \asymp \frac{1}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \wedge \frac{t}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \quad \text{for } 0 < t \leq 1 \text{ and } x, y \in M.$$

Combining this with (2.6), we get that for all $f \in L^2(M)$,

$$\sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{1}{t} \langle f - Q_t^s f, f \rangle \leq \frac{c_1}{2} \int_{M \times M} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{1}{t} \langle f - Q_t^s f, f \rangle &\geq \frac{1}{2c_1} \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \int_{M \times M: d(x, y) \geq t^{1/(\beta s)}} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ &= \frac{1}{2c_1} \int_{M \times M} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy), \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. \square

2.1 Analysis of the subordinator ξ^s

In this subsection, we establish some estimates on the distribution of ξ^s which do not depend on $s \in [s_0, 1)$. Define $H_s : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by

$$H_s(\lambda) := \phi_s(\lambda) - \lambda \phi'_s(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-\lambda t} - \lambda t e^{-\lambda t}) \Pi_s(dt).$$

Note that ϕ_s and H_s are increasing continuous functions with $\phi_s(0+) = H_s(0+) = 0$ and $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \phi_s(\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} H_s(\lambda) = \Pi_s((0, \infty)) = \infty$, and ϕ'_s is a decreasing continuous function with $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \phi'_s(\lambda) = 0$. Let ϕ_s^{-1} and $(\phi'_s)^{-1}$ be the inverse functions of ϕ_s and ϕ'_s respectively. For each fixed $t > 0$, define a function $g_{s,t} : (0, t\phi'_s(0+)) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by

$$g_{s,t}(a) := (\phi'_s)^{-1}(a/t).$$

By [36, Lemma 5.2], we get the following left tail probability estimates for ξ^s .

Proposition 2.2. (i) For all $t > 0$ and $a \in (0, t\phi'_s(0+))$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq a) \leq \exp(-t(H_s \circ g_{s,t})(a)).$$

(ii) For all $k > 0$, $t > 0$ and $a \in (0, t\phi'_s(0+))$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq a) \geq \left(1 - \frac{(1+k)c_0}{k^2 t(H_s \circ g_{s,t})(a)}\right) \exp(-(1+2k)t(H_s \circ g_{s,t})(a)),$$

where $c_0 := \sup_{\lambda > 0} (-\lambda^2 \phi''_s(\lambda))/H_s(\lambda)$.

We will use the following elementary inequality several times in this paper.

$$e^{-r} \leq (er/a)^{-a} \quad \text{for all } r, a > 0, \quad (2.7)$$

Lemma 2.3. (i) $-\lambda^2 \phi_s''(\lambda) \leq 2H_s(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda > 0$.
(ii) $\phi_s^{-1}(7/t)^{-1} \leq t\phi_s'(H_s^{-1}(1/t)) \leq \phi_s^{-1}(1/t)^{-1}$ for all $t > 0$.

Proof. (i) Using $1 - e^{-r} - re^{-r} \geq r^2 e^{-r}/2$ for all $r \geq 1$, we get that for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$-\lambda^2 \phi_s''(\lambda) = m_s(1-s) \int_0^\infty (\lambda t)^2 e^{-\lambda t} t^{-1-s} dt \leq 2H_s(\lambda).$$

(ii) The result follows from [22, Lemma 2.4(i)] and the inequality $(e^2 - e)/(e - 2) < 7$. \square

Lemma 2.4. (i) $\phi_s'(\lambda) \geq e^{-1} m_s \lambda^{s-1}$ for all $\lambda > 0$.

(ii) For all $\lambda > 0$,

$$H_s(\lambda) \geq \frac{(1 - 2e^{-1})m_s(1-s)}{s} \lambda^s.$$

(iii) For all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\frac{m_s}{es} \lambda^s \leq \phi_s(\lambda) \leq \frac{m_s}{s} \lambda^s. \quad (2.8)$$

Consequently, it holds that

$$\left(\frac{m_s}{es}\right)^{1/s} t^{1/s} \leq \phi_s^{-1}(1/t)^{-1} \leq \left(\frac{m_s}{s}\right)^{1/s} t^{1/s} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Proof. (i) For all $\lambda > 0$, we get

$$\phi_s'(\lambda) \geq m_s(1-s) \int_0^{1/\lambda} t^{-s} e^{-\lambda t} dt \geq e^{-1} m_s(1-s) \int_0^{1/\lambda} t^{-s} dt = e^{-1} m_s \lambda^{s-1}.$$

(ii) Using the inequality $1 - e^{-r} - re^{-r} \geq 1 - 2e^{-1}$ for $r \geq 1$, we get that for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$H_s(\lambda) \geq (1 - 2e^{-1})m_s(1-s) \int_{1/\lambda}^\infty t^{-1-s} dt = \frac{(1 - 2e^{-1})m_s(1-s)}{s} \lambda^s.$$

(iii) Since $1 - e^{-r} \geq (r \wedge 1)/e$ for all $r > 0$, it holds that for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\phi_s(\lambda) \geq \frac{m_s(1-s)}{e} \left(\lambda \int_0^{1/\lambda} t^{-s} dt + \int_{1/\lambda}^\infty t^{-1-s} dt \right) = \frac{m_s}{es} \lambda^s.$$

Moreover, since $1 - e^{-r} \leq r \wedge 1$ for all $r > 0$, we have

$$\phi_s(\lambda) \leq m_s(1-s) \int_0^{1/\lambda} \lambda t^{-s} dt + (1-s) \int_{1/\lambda}^\infty t^{-1-s} dt = \frac{m_s}{s} \lambda^s.$$

Hence, (2.8) holds. Now, by (2.8), we get that for all $t > 0$,

$$\frac{m_s}{es} \phi_s^{-1}(1/t)^s \leq \frac{1}{t} \leq \frac{m_s}{s} \phi_s^{-1}(1/t)^s.$$

\square

Lemma 2.5. (i) For all $t > 0$ and $a > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq a) \leq \exp \left(- \frac{(1 + \alpha/\beta)(1-s)}{s} \left(\frac{t^{1/s}}{ea} \right)^{s/(1-s)} \right).$$

(ii) There exists a constant $K > 1$ independent of s such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(K^{-1} t^{1/s} < \xi_t^s \leq K t^{1/s} \right) \geq e^{-7}/18 \quad \text{for all } t > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. (i) Let $t, a > 0$. By Lemma 2.4(i), since $\phi'_s(g_{s,t}(a)) = a/t$, we have

$$g_{s,t}(a) \geq (e^{-1} m_s t / a)^{1/(1-s)}.$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.4(ii), we obtain

$$(H_s \circ g_{s,t})(a) \geq \frac{(1 - 2e^{-1})m_s(1-s)}{s} \left(\frac{m_s t}{ea} \right)^{s/(1-s)}. \quad (2.10)$$

Using Proposition 2.2(i) and (2.10) in the first line below, and the definition (2.1) of m_s in the second, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq a) &\leq \exp \left(- \frac{(1 - 2e^{-1})m_s^{1/(1-s)}(1-s)}{s} \left(\frac{t^{1/s}}{ea} \right)^{s/(1-s)} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(- \frac{(1 + \alpha/\beta)(1-s)}{s} \left(\frac{t^{1/s}}{ea} \right)^{s/(1-s)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Let $t > 0$ and set $a_0 := t\phi'_s(H_s^{-1}(1/t))$. By Proposition 2.2(ii) (with $k = 3$) and Lemma 2.3(i), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq a_0) \geq \left(1 - \frac{8}{9t(H_s \circ g_{s,t})(a_0)} \right) \exp(-7t(H_s \circ g_{s,t})(a_0)) = e^{-7}/9.$$

Using this, the monotonicity of ξ^s , Lemma 2.3(ii), Lemma 2.4(iii) and (2.2), we get

$$e^{-7}/9 \leq \mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq \phi_s^{-1}(1/t)^{-1}) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\xi_t^s \leq (m_s/s)^{1/s} t^{1/s} \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\xi_t^s \leq (m_0/s_0)^{1/s_0} t^{1/s} \right). \quad (2.11)$$

Let $c_1 := \log(18e^7)$ and $a_1 := t\phi'_s(H_s^{-1}(c_1/t))$. By Proposition 2.2(i),

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq a_1) \leq e^{-c_1} = e^{-7}/18.$$

Hence, using the monotonicity of ξ^s , Lemma 2.3(ii), Lemma 2.4(iii) and (2.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-7}/18 &\geq \mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq c_1 \phi_s^{-1}(7c_1/t)^{-1}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left(\xi_t^s \leq c_1 (m_s/(es))^{1/s} (t/(7c_1))^{1/s} \right) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\xi_t^s \leq c_1 (7ec_1)^{-1/s_0} t^{1/s} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.11), we arrive at (2.9) (with $K = (m_0/s_0)^{1/s_0} \vee ((7ec_1)^{1/s_0}/c_1)$). \square

2.2 Analysis of the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$

Recall that a constant is considered independent of $s \in [s_0, 1)$, if it may depend on s_0 but remains unaffected by the specific value of s . We also recall that \bar{R} denotes $\text{diam}(M)$.

We begin with the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $b > 0$, $x \in M$ and $r > 0$,*

$$\int_{B(x,r)^c} \frac{1}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^b} \mu(dy) \leq \frac{Ce^b}{br^b}.$$

Proof. Using VD and the inequality $1 - e^{-b} \geq be^{-b}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x,r)^c} \frac{1}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^b} \mu(dy) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, e^n r) \setminus B(x, e^{n-1} r)} \frac{1}{V(x, e^{n-1} r)(e^{n-1} r)^b} \mu(dy) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{r^b} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{V(x, e^n r)}{V(x, e^{n-1} r)e^{(n-1)b}} \leq \frac{c_1}{r^b} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-(n-1)b} \leq \frac{c_1 e^b}{br^b}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.7. *There exists $C > 1$ independent of s such that*

$$\frac{C^{-1}(1-s)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \leq J_s(x, y) \leq \frac{C(1-s)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in M.$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in M$. Then $(2d(x, y)/\eta)^\beta \leq (2\bar{R}/\eta)^\beta$. Using (2.4) and (1.2) in the first inequality below, VD in the second, and RVD in the third, we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_s(x, y) &\geq c_1(1-s) \int_{(d(x, y)/\eta)^\beta}^{(2d(x, y)/\eta)^\beta} \frac{t^{-1-s}}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} dt \geq c_2(1-s) \int_{(d(x, y)/\eta)^\beta}^{(2d(x, y)/\eta)^\beta} \frac{t^{-1-s}}{V(x, \eta t^{1/\beta}/2)} dt \\ &\geq \frac{c_3(1-s)}{V(x, d(x, y))} \int_{(d(x, y)/\eta)^\beta}^{(2d(x, y)/\eta)^\beta} t^{-1-s} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\eta t^{1/\beta}/2} \right)^{\alpha_0} dt \\ &= \frac{c_3 \eta^{\beta s + \alpha_0} (1 - 2^{-\alpha_0 - \beta s})(1-s)}{(\eta/2)^{\alpha_0} (s + \alpha_0/\beta) V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \geq \frac{2^{\alpha_0} c_3 \eta^\beta (1 - 2^{-\alpha_0})(1-s)}{(1 + \alpha_0/\beta) V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (2.4) and (1.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_s(x, y) &\leq c_4(1-s) \int_0^{d(x, y)^\beta} \frac{t^{-1-s}}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} \exp \left(-c_5 \left(\frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{t} \right)^{1/(\beta-1)} \right) dt \\ &\quad + c_4(1-s) \int_{d(x, y)^\beta}^{\bar{R}^\beta} \frac{t^{-1-s}}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} dt + c_4(1-s) \int_{\bar{R}^\beta}^{\infty} \frac{t^{-1-s}}{V(x, \bar{R})} dt \\ &=: c_4(1-s)(I_1 + I_2 + I_3). \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , using (2.7) in the first inequality below and VD in the second, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \frac{c_6}{V(x, d(x, y))} \int_0^{d(x, y)^\beta} t^{-1-s} \frac{V(x, d(x, y))}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} \left(\frac{t}{d(x, y)^\beta} \right)^{2+\alpha/\beta} dt \\ &\leq \frac{c_7}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{2\beta}} \int_0^{d(x, y)^\beta} t^{1-s} dt \\ &= \frac{c_7}{(2-s)V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \leq \frac{c_7}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}}. \end{aligned}$$

For I_2 , using RVD, we obtain

$$I_2 \leq \frac{c_8 d(x, y)^{\alpha_0}}{V(x, d(x, y))} \int_{d(x, y)^\beta}^{\bar{R}^\beta} t^{-1-s-\alpha_0/\beta} dt \leq \frac{c_8}{(\alpha_0/\beta) V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}}.$$

When $\bar{R} < \infty$, using VD, we also get

$$I_3 = \frac{1}{s V(x, \bar{R}) \bar{R}^{\beta s}} \leq \frac{1}{s_0 V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 2.8. *There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that*

$$\int_{B(x, r)^c} J_s(x, y) \mu(dy) \leq \frac{C(1-s)}{r^{\beta s}} \quad \text{for all } x \in M \text{ and } r > 0.$$

Proof. Using Proposition 2.7 in the first inequality below and Lemma 2.6 in the second, we get that for all $x \in M$ and $r > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x, r)^c} J_s(x, y) \mu(dy) \\ & \leq c_1(1-s) \int_{B(x, r)^c} \frac{\mu(dy)}{V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \leq \frac{c_2 e^{\beta s} (1-s)}{\beta s r^{\beta s}} \leq \frac{c_2 e^{\beta} (1-s)}{\beta s_0 r^{\beta s}}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Recall that $q_s(t, x, y)$ is the heat kernel of $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$ defined as (2.5). We establish a robust near-diagonal estimate for $q_s(t, x, y)$.

Proposition 2.9. *There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that*

$$q_s(t, x, y) \leq \frac{C}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } x, y \in M. \quad (2.12)$$

Proof. For all $t > 0$ and $x, y \in M$, using (1.2) in the first line below, VD in the third, Lemma 2.5(i) in the fourth, and the inequality $e^r \geq r$ for all $r > 0$ in the fifth, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_s(t, x, y) & \leq c_1 \int_0^\infty \frac{\mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \in da)}{V(x, a^{1/\beta})} \\ & \leq \frac{c_1 \mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \geq e^{-1} t^{1/s})}{V(x, (e^{-1} t^{1/s})^{1/\beta})} + c_1 \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{\mathbb{P}(e^{-n-2} t^{1/s} < \xi_t^s \leq e^{-n-1} t^{1/s})}{V(x, (e^{-n-2} t^{1/s})^{1/\beta})} \\ & \leq \frac{c_2 e^{\alpha/\beta}}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} + \frac{c_2 e^{2\alpha/\beta}}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{n\alpha/\beta} \mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \leq e^{-n-1} t^{1/s}) \\ & \leq \frac{c_2 e^{\alpha/\beta}}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} + \frac{c_2 e^{2\alpha/\beta}}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \sum_{n=0}^\infty \exp\left(\frac{n\alpha}{\beta} - \frac{(1+\alpha/\beta)(1-s)}{s} e^{ns/(1-s)}\right) \\ & \leq \frac{c_2 e^{\alpha/\beta}}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} + \frac{c_2 e^{2\alpha/\beta}}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \sum_{n=0}^\infty \exp(-n) = \frac{c_3}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

For a non-empty open set $D \subset M$, let $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}_D^s)$ be the part of $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$ on D and $(Q_t^{s,D})_{t \geq 0}$ be its semigroup.

Proposition 2.10. *For any bounded non-empty quasi-open set $D \subset M$, $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}_D^s)$ has a heat kernel $q_s^D(t, x, y)$ defined on $(0, \infty) \times M \times M$.*

Proof. Let $x_0 \in M$ and $R > 0$ be such that $D \subset B(x_0, R)$. For every $t > 0$ and $f \in L^1(D)$ with $\|f\|_1 = 1$, by the L^∞ -contractivity of $(Q_t^{s,D})_{t \geq 0}$, Proposition 2.9 and VD*, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_t^{s,D} f\|_\infty &\leq \|Q_{t \wedge 1}^{s,D} f\|_\infty \\ &\leq \inf_{x \in D} \frac{c_1}{V(x, (t \wedge 1)^{1/(\beta s)})} \leq \frac{c_2}{V(x_0, R + (t \wedge 1)^{1/(\beta s)})} \left(\frac{R + (t \wedge 1)^{1/(\beta s)}}{(t \wedge 1)^{1/(\beta s)}} \right)^\alpha < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now, the result follows from [30, Theorem 2.1]. \square

Proposition 2.11. *$(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$ satisfies rFK $_\beta(s)$ with $R_0 = \bar{R}$ and $K_2 = 2$.*

Proof. Let $x_0 \in M$, $0 < r < \bar{R}/2$ and $D \subset B(x_0, r)$ be a non-empty open set. Set $U := B(x_0, r)$ and $V := B(x_0, 2r)$. Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_D^s$ be such that $\|f\|_2 = 1$. Since $f = 0$ in D^c , we have

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f, f) \leq 2 \left(\int_{D \times V} + \int_{D \times V^c} \right) (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_s(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) =: 2(I_1 + I_2).$$

By Proposition 2.7, since $D \subset V$, we have

$$I_1 \leq c_1(1-s) \int_{V \times V} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy). \quad (2.13)$$

Further, using Corollary 2.8, since $\|f\|_2 = 1$, we get

$$I_2 \leq 2 \int_D f(x)^2 \int_{B(x, r)^c} J_s(x, y) \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \leq \frac{c_2(1-s)}{r^{\beta s}}. \quad (2.14)$$

On the other hand, by [27, Lemma 1.3.4(i)], it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f, f) \geq \sup_{t > 0} \left[\frac{1}{t} \langle f - Q_t^{s,D} f, f \rangle \right] = \sup_{t > 0} \left[\frac{1}{t} (1 - \langle Q_t^{s,D} f, f \rangle) \right]. \quad (2.15)$$

For all $t > 0$, using the symmetry of q_s^D , the AM-GM inequality, and Fubini's theorem in the first inequality below, and Proposition 2.9 in the second, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Q_t^{s,D} f, f \rangle &= \int_{D \times D} q_s^D(t, x, y) f(x) f(y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ &\leq \int_D f(x)^2 \int_D q_s^D(t, x, y) \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \leq c_3 \mu(D) \int_D \frac{f(x)^2}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \mu(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using VD*, we get that for all $0 < t \leq r^{\beta s}$,

$$\langle Q_t^{s,D} f, f \rangle \leq \frac{c_4 \mu(D)}{V(x_0, r)} \left(\frac{2r}{t^{1/(\beta s)}} \right)^\alpha \int_D f^2 d\mu = \frac{2^\alpha c_4 \mu(D)}{V(x_0, r)} \left(\frac{r}{t^{1/(\beta s)}} \right)^\alpha. \quad (2.16)$$

We assume that, without loss of generality, the constant c_4 in (2.16) is greater than 1. If $2^{\alpha+1} c_4 \mu(D) \geq V(x_0, r)$, then by choosing C to be greater than $(2^{\alpha+1} c_4)^{\beta/\alpha}$, we get (1.5). Assume that $2^{\alpha+1} c_4 \mu(D) < V(x_0, r)$. By taking

$$t = \left(\frac{2^{\alpha+1} c_4 \mu(D)}{V(x_0, r)} \right)^{\beta s / \alpha} r^{\beta s},$$

we get from (2.15) and (2.16) that

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f, f) \geq \frac{1}{2r^{\beta s}} \left(\frac{V(x_0, r)}{2^{\alpha+1} c_4 \mu(D)} \right)^{\beta s / \alpha} \geq \frac{1}{2^{1+(\alpha+1)\beta/\alpha} c_4^{\beta/\alpha} r^{\beta s}} \left(\frac{V(x_0, r)}{\mu(D)} \right)^{\beta s / \alpha}.$$

Combining this with (2.13) and (2.14), the result follows. The proof is complete. \square

For a non-empty open set $D \subset M$, let $(\mathcal{E}^L, \mathcal{F}_D^L)$ be the part of $(\mathcal{E}^L, \mathcal{F}^L)$ on D and $(Q_t^D)_{t \geq 0}$ be its semigroup. Since Z has a jointly continuous transition density q , and $q(t, x, y) = q(t, y, x) \leq c/V(x, t^{1/\beta}) < \infty$ for all $t > 0$ and $x, y \in M$, from the strong Markov property, we deduce that $(Q_t^D)_{t \geq 0}$ has a heat kernel q^D given by the Dynkin-Hunt formula:

$$q^D(t, x, y) = q(t, x, y) - \mathbb{E}^x \left[q(t - \tau_D^Z, Z_{\tau_D^Z}, y) : \tau_D^Z < t \right], \quad t > 0, x, y \in D, \quad (2.17)$$

where $\tau_D^Z := \inf\{t > 0 : Z_t \notin D\}$ denotes the first exit time of Z from D .

Proposition 2.12. *There exist constants $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, 1/2)$ and $C > 0$ such that for any $x_0 \in M$ and $r \in (0, \bar{R})$,*

$$q^{B(x_0, r)}(t, x, y) \geq \frac{C}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \varepsilon_1 r^\beta] \text{ and } x, y \in B(x_0, \varepsilon_2 t^{1/\beta}).$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\varepsilon_2 \in (0, \eta/2)$ be constants determined later, where $\eta \in (0, 1)$ is the constant in (1.2). Fix $x_0 \in M$ and $r \in (0, \bar{R})$. Write $B := B(x_0, r)$. By (2.17) and (1.2), we have for all $t \in (0, \varepsilon_1 r^\beta]$ and $x, y \in B(x_0, \varepsilon_2 t^{1/\beta})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & q^B(t, x, y) \\ & \geq \frac{c_1}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})} - \mathbb{E}^x \left[\frac{c_2}{V(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, (t - \tau_B^Z)^{1/\beta})} \exp \left(-c_3 \left(\frac{d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, y)^\beta}{t - \tau_B^Z} \right)^{1/(\beta-1)} \right) : \tau_B^Z < t \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Observe that

$$d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, x) \wedge d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, y) \geq r - \varepsilon_1^{1/\beta} \varepsilon_2 r > r/2 \quad \text{and} \quad t - \tau_B^Z \leq t \leq \varepsilon_1 r^\beta. \quad (2.19)$$

In particular, since $d(x, y) \leq 2\varepsilon_2 t^{1/\beta} < r$, we have

$$d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, x) \leq d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, y) + r < 3d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, y). \quad (2.20)$$

Using (2.7) in the first inequality below, (2.20) in the second, VD* in the third, and (2.19) in the fourth, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^x \left[\frac{c_2}{V(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, (t - \tau_B^Z)^{1/\beta})} \exp \left(-c_3 \left(\frac{d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, y)^\beta}{t - \tau_B^Z} \right)^{1/(\beta-1)} \right) : \tau_B^Z < t \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}^x \left[\frac{c_4}{V(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, (t - \tau_B^Z)^{1/\beta})} \left(\frac{(t - \tau_B^Z)^{1/\beta}}{d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, y)} \right)^{\alpha+1} : \tau_B^Z < t \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}^x \left[\frac{6^{d_2+1} c_4}{V(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, (t - \tau_B^Z)^{1/\beta})} \left(\frac{(t - \tau_B^Z)^{1/\beta}}{2d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, x)} \right)^{\alpha+1} : \tau_B^Z < t \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}^x \left[\frac{c_5 (t - \tau_B^Z)^{1/\beta}}{2d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, x) V(x, 2d(Z_{\tau_B^Z}, x))} : \tau_B^Z < t \right] \leq \frac{c_5 \varepsilon_1^{1/\beta}}{V(x, t^{1/\beta})}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.18) and taking ε_1 smaller than $(c_1/(2c_5))^\beta$, we get the result. \square

Proposition 2.13. *There exist constants $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1/2)$ and $C > 0$ independent of s such that for any $x_0 \in M$ and $r \in (0, \bar{R})$,*

$$q_s^{B(x_0, r)}(t, x, y) \geq \frac{C}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, (\delta_1 r)^{\beta s}] \text{ and } \mu\text{-a.e. } x, y \in B(x_0, \delta_2 t^{1/(\beta s)}).$$

Proof. Let $x_0 \in M$ and $r \in (0, \bar{R})$. Write $B := B(x_0, r)$. Define for $t > 0$ and $x, y \in B$,

$$r_s^B(t, x, y) := \int_0^\infty q^B(a, x, y) \mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \in da).$$

By [52, Proposition 3.1], we have $q_s^B(t, x, y) \geq r_s^B(t, x, y)$ for all $t > 0$ and μ -a.e. $x, y \in B$. Thus, it suffices to show that there exist constants $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1/2)$ and $c_1 > 0$ independent of s , x_0 and r such that

$$r_s^B(t, x, y) \geq \frac{c_1}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, (\delta_1 r)^{\beta s}] \text{ and } x, y \in B(x_0, \delta_2 t^{1/(\beta s)}).$$

Let $K > 1$ be the constant in Lemma 2.5(ii), and $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, 1/2)$ be the constants in Proposition 2.12. Set $\delta_1 := (\varepsilon_1/K)^{1/\beta}$ and $\delta_2 := \varepsilon_2/K^{1/\beta}$. For all $t \in (0, (\delta_1 r)^{\beta s}]$, we have $Kt^{1/s} \leq K\delta_1^{\beta} r^{\beta} = \varepsilon_1 r^{\beta}$ and $\delta_2 t^{1/(\beta s)} = \varepsilon_2 (K^{-1} t^{1/s})^{1/\beta}$. Using Proposition 2.12 in the first inequality below, and VD and Lemma 2.5(ii) in the third, we get that for all $t \in (0, \delta_1 r^{\beta s}]$ and $x, y \in B(x_0, \delta_2 t^{1/(\beta s)})$,

$$r_s^B(t, x, y) \geq c_2 \int_{K^{-1}t^{1/s}}^{Kt^{1/s}} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\xi_t^s \in da)}{V(x, a^{1/\beta})} \geq \frac{c_2 \mathbb{P}(K^{-1}t^{1/s} \leq \xi_t^s \leq Kt^{1/s})}{V(x, K^{1/\beta} t^{1/(\beta s)})} \geq \frac{c_3}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})}.$$

□

Proposition 2.14. *$(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$ satisfies $\text{rPI}_\beta(s)$ with $R_0 = \bar{R}$.*

Proof. We follow the proof of [20, Proposition 3.5(i)], which was motivated by the argument in [42, Theorem 5.1]. Let $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1/2)$ be the constants in Proposition 2.13 and set $K_1 := 1/(\delta_1 \delta_2)$. Let $x_0 \in M$ and $0 < r < \bar{R}/K_1$. Write $B := B(x_0, r)$ and $V := B(x_0, K_1 r)$.

Consider a bilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{s,V}(f, f) &:= \int_{V \times V} (f(y) - f(x))(g(y) - g(x)) J_s(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy), \\ \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}] &:= \{f \in L^2(V) : \mathcal{C}^{s,V}(f, f) < \infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.7(i), we have

$$\mathcal{C}^{s,V}(f, f) \leq c_1(1-s) \int_{V \times V} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{F}^s. \quad (2.21)$$

Hence, $\mathcal{F}^s|_V \subset \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}]$. Further, by Fatou's lemma, we see that $(\mathcal{C}^{s,V}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}])$ is closable and is a Dirichlet form on $L^2(V)$. Let $(\bar{Q}_t^{s,V})_{t>0}$ be the semigroup associated with $(\mathcal{C}^{s,V}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}])$. Since $\mathcal{C}^{s,V}(\mathbf{1}_V, \mathbf{1}_V) = 0$ and $\mathbf{1}_V \in \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}]$, the semigroup $(\bar{Q}_t^{s,V})_{t>0}$ is conservative. Let $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}]_V$ be the closure of $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}] \cap C_c(V)$ in $L^2(V)$ and let $(\bar{R}_t^{s,V})_{t>0}$ be the semigroup associated with $(\mathcal{C}^{s,V}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}]_V)$. According to [16, Theorem 5.2.17], $(\mathcal{C}^{s,V}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}]_V)$ is the resurrected Dirichlet form of $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}_V^s)$. Since $(\mathcal{C}^{s,V}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}]_V)$ is a part of $(\mathcal{C}^{s,V}, \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{C}^{s,V}])$, it follows that

$$\bar{Q}_t^{s,V} f \geq \bar{R}_t^{s,V} f \geq Q_t^{s,V} f \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq f \in L^2(V). \quad (2.22)$$

Set $t_0 := (\delta_1 K_1 r)^{\beta s} = (r/\delta_2)^{\beta s}$. For all $f \in \mathcal{F}^s$, using [27, Lemma 1.3.4(i)] in the first line below, the conservativeness and the symmetry of $(\overline{Q}_t^{s,V})_{t \geq 0}$ in the second, (2.22) in the third, Proposition 2.13 in the fourth and VD in the last, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}^{s,V}(f, f) &\geq \frac{1}{t_0} \int_V f(x)(f(x) - \overline{Q}_{t_0}^{s,V} f(x)) \mu(dx) \\
&= \frac{1}{t_0} \int_V \overline{Q}_{t_0}^{s,V} \left(\frac{1}{2} f(z)^2 - f(z)f(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2} f(\cdot)^2 \right) (x) \Big|_{z=x} \mu(dx) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2t_0} \int_V Q_{t_0}^{s,V} (f(z) - f(\cdot))^2 (x) \Big|_{z=x} \mu(dx) \\
&\geq \frac{c_2}{2t_0} \int_B \int_B \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, t_0^{1/(\beta s)})} \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \\
&\geq \frac{c_3 \delta_2^\beta}{2r^{\beta s}} \int_B \int_B \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, r)} \mu(dy) \mu(dx). \tag{2.23}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using VD* in the third inequality below, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_B \int_B \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, r)} \mu(dy) \mu(dx) &\geq \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \int_B \frac{(f(x) - a)^2}{V(x, r)} \mu(dx) \int_B \mu(dy) \\
&\geq \inf_{x \in B} \frac{V(x_0, r)}{V(x, r)} \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \int_B (f(x) - a)^2 \mu(dx) \geq c_4 \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \int_B (f(x) - a)^2 \mu(dx) = c_4 \int_B (f - \overline{f}_B)^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.21) and (2.23), we get the desired result. \square

For a non-empty open set $D \subset M$, denote by $(G_\lambda^{s,D})_{\lambda > 0}$ the resolvent corresponding to the semigroup $(Q_t^{s,D})_{t > 0}$ defined by

$$G_\lambda^{s,D} f := \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} Q_t^{s,D} f dt \quad \text{for } \lambda > 0 \text{ and } f \in L^2(D).$$

By [27, Theorem 4.4.1(i)], for any $\lambda > 0$ and $f \in L^2(D)$, we have $G_\lambda^{s,D} f \in \mathcal{F}_D^s$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda^s(G_\lambda^{s,D} f, v) = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{F}_D^s. \tag{2.24}$$

Lemma 2.15. *There exists a constant $\kappa \geq 1$ independent of s such that the following holds: Let $x_0 \in M$, $R > 0$ and $r \in (0, \overline{R})$. For $U_0 := B(x_0, R)$, $U_1 := B(x_0, R + r)$ and $\lambda := r^{-\beta s}$, we have*

$$\lambda G_\lambda^{s,U_1} \mathbf{1}_{U_1} \leq 1 \quad \mu\text{-a.e. on } U_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda G_\lambda^{s,U_1} \mathbf{1}_{U_1} \geq 1/\kappa \quad \mu\text{-a.e. on } U_0. \tag{2.25}$$

Proof. For any $0 \leq f \in L^2(U_1)$, we have

$$\langle \lambda G_\lambda^{s,U_1} \mathbf{1}_{U_1}, f \rangle = \int_0^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \langle Q_t^{s,U_1} \mathbf{1}_{U_1}, f \rangle \leq \|f\|_{L^1(U_1)} \int_0^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda t} dt = \|f\|_{L^1(U_1)}.$$

Hence, $\lambda G_\lambda^{s,U_1} \mathbf{1}_{U_1} \leq 1$ μ -a.e. on U_1 . On the other hand, by Proposition 2.13 and VD, for any $t \in (0, (\delta_1 r)^{\beta s}]$ and a.e. $x \in U_0$,

$$Q_t^{s,U_1} \mathbf{1}_{U_1}(x) \geq Q_t^{s,B(x,r)} \mathbf{1}_{B(x,r)}(x) \geq \frac{c_1}{V(x, t^{1/(\beta s)})} \int_{B(x, \delta_2 t^{1/(\beta s)})} \mu(dy) \geq c_2.$$

Using this, we get that for any $0 \leq f \in L^2(U_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \lambda G_\lambda^{s,U_1} \mathbf{1}_{U_1}, f \rangle &\geq \int_0^{\delta_1^{\beta s}/\lambda} \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \int_{U_0} f(x) Q_t^{s,U_1} \mathbf{1}_{U_1}(x) \mu(dx) dt \\ &\geq c_2 \|f\|_{L^1(U_0)} \int_0^{\delta_1^{\beta s}/\lambda} \lambda e^{-\lambda t} dt = c_2 (1 - e^{-\delta_1^{\beta s}}) \|f\|_{L^1(U_0)} \geq c_2 (1 - e^{-\delta_1^{\beta}}) \|f\|_{L^1(U_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the second inequality in (2.25) holds with $\kappa = 1/(c_2(1 - e^{-\delta_1^{\beta}}))$. \square

Denote $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^s := \{f + a : f \in \mathcal{F}^s, a \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b^s := \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^s \cap L^\infty(M)$. Since \mathcal{E}^s has no killing part, the bilinear form \mathcal{E}^s can be extended to functions from $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^s$ by letting

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f + a, g + b) := \mathcal{E}^s(f, g) \quad \text{for all } f, g \in \mathcal{F}^s, a, b \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We now establish a robust generalized capacity condition for $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$. The proof of the following result is originally due to [1, Lemma 5.4] and [29, Lemma 2.8].

Lemma 2.16. *For any $x_0 \in M$, $R > 0$ and $r \in (0, \bar{R})$, there exists a κ -cutoff function $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}^s$ for $B(x_0, R) \Subset B(x_0, R + r)$ such that*

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f^2 \varphi, \varphi) \leq \frac{\kappa^2}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{B(x_0, R+r)} f^2 d\mu \quad \text{for any } f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b^s, \quad (2.26)$$

where $\kappa \geq 1$ is the constant in Lemma 2.15.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in M$, $R > 0$ and $r \in (0, \bar{R})$. Set $\lambda := r^{-\beta s}$ and $\varphi := \kappa \lambda G_\lambda^{s, B(x_0, R+r)} \mathbf{1}_{B(x_0, R+r)}$. Then $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_{B(x_0, R+r)}^s$. Further, by Lemma 2.15, φ is a κ -cutoff function for $B(x_0, R) \Subset B(x_0, R + r)$. According to [31, Proposition 15.1], whenever $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b^s$, we have $f^2 \varphi \in \mathcal{F}_{B(x_0, R+r)}^s$. Hence, using (2.24), we get that for any $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b^s$,

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f^2 \varphi, \varphi) \leq \mathcal{E}_\lambda^s(f^2 \varphi, \varphi) = \kappa \lambda \langle f^2 \varphi, \mathbf{1}_{U_1} \rangle \leq \kappa^2 \lambda \int_{U_1} f^2 d\mu.$$

\square

Recall the following property of nonlocal Dirichlet forms from [21, Lemma 3.5].

Lemma 2.17. *For any Borel subset $D \subset M$, constant $k > 1$, and any $f, g \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b^s$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - k^{-1}) \int_{D \times D} f(x)^2 (g(x) - g(y))^2 J_s(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ &\leq \int_{D \times D} (f(x)^2 g(x) - f(y)^2 g(y)) (g(x) - g(y)) J_s(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ &\quad + k \int_{D \times D} g(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_s(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy), \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

provided that all three integrals in (2.27) are absolutely integrable.

Following the proof of [29, Lemma 2.4], we deduce the next result from Lemma 2.16. We give a detailed proof for completeness.

Proposition 2.18. *$(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$ satisfies $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ with $R_0 = \bar{R}$.*

Proof. Let $x_0 \in M$, $R > 0$ and $r \in (0, \bar{R})$. Define $U_a = B(x_0, R + ar)$ for $a \geq 0$. Let $\kappa \geq 1$ be the constant in Lemma 2.15. By Lemma 2.16, there exists a κ -cutoff function $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}^s$ for $U_0 \Subset U_1$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f^2\varphi, \varphi) \leq \frac{\kappa^2}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_1} f^2 d\mu \quad \text{for all } f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b^s. \quad (2.28)$$

Set $\phi := \varphi \wedge 1$. Then $\phi \in \mathcal{F}^s$ and ϕ is a cutoff function for $U_0 \Subset U_1$. Moreover, using Proposition 2.7 and the fact $|\phi(x) - \phi(y)| \leq |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|$ for $x, y \in M$ in the first inequality below, and Lemma 2.17 (with $k = 2$) in the second, we get that for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b^s$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (1-s) \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \frac{f(x)^2(\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ & \leq c_1 \int_{U_2 \times U_2} f(x)^2(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))^2 J_s(x, y) \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ & \leq 2c_1 \int_{U_2 \times U_2} (f(x)^2\varphi(x) - f(y)^2\varphi(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) J_s(x, y) \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ & \quad + 4c_1 \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \varphi(x)^2(f(x) - f(y))^2 J_s(x, y) \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ & =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

For all $x, y \in (M \times M) \setminus (U_2 \times U_2)$, since either $\varphi(x) = 0$ or $\varphi(y) = 0$, we have $(f(x)^2\varphi(x) - f(y)^2\varphi(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) \geq 0$. Hence, using (2.28), we get

$$I_1 \leq 2c_1 \mathcal{E}^s(f^2\varphi, \varphi) \leq \frac{2c_1\kappa^2}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_1} f^2 d\mu. \quad (2.29)$$

Moreover, by Proposition 2.7, since $\varphi^2 \leq \kappa^2\phi^2$ and $\varphi = 0$ in U_1^c , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 & \leq c_2(1-s) \int_{U_1 \times U_2} \frac{\varphi(x)^2(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ & \leq \kappa^2 c_2(1-s) \int_{U_1 \times U_2} \frac{\phi(x)^2(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy). \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

On the other hand, since ϕ is a cutoff function for $U_0 \Subset U_1$, by Lemma 2.6, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & (1-s) \int_{U_2 \times U_2^c} \frac{f(x)^2(\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ & \leq (1-s) \int_{U_1} f(x)^2 \int_{U_2^c} \frac{\mu(dy)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \\ & \leq (1-s) \int_{U_1} f(x)^2 \int_{B(x, r)^c} \frac{\mu(dy)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \\ & \leq \frac{c_3 e^{\beta s}(1-s)}{(\beta s)r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_1} f^2 d\mu \leq \frac{c_3 e^{\beta}(1-s)}{(\beta s_0)r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_1} f^2 d\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Combining (2.29), (2.30) and (2.31), we arrive at the desired result. \square

3 Robust function inequalities under $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$

We begin with a standard covering lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $k \geq 1$, there exists $N_0 = N_0(k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $r > 0$, there exists an open covering $\{B(z_i, r)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of M satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathbf{1}_{B(z_i, kr)} \leq N_0 \text{ on } M. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. By the Vitali covering lemma, there exists a collection $\{B(z_i, r/5)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of pairwise disjoint open balls in M such that $M = \cup_{i=1}^\infty B(z_i, r)$. Suppose that $y \in M$ is in N of the balls $B(z_i, kr)$ (N may be infinite). Then $B(y, (k+1)r)$ contains at least N balls $B(z_i, r)$. By VD^* , when $y \in B(z_i, kr)$, we have $V(z_i, r) \geq c_1 V(y, (k+1)r)$. It follows that

$$V(y, (k+1)r) \geq \sum_{i: y \in B(z_i, kr)} V(z_i, r) \geq c_1 N V(y, (k+1)r).$$

This leads to the conclusion that $N \leq 1/c_1$, establishing (3.1). \square

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ holds. There exists $C \geq 1$ independent of s such that for all $x_0 \in M$, $r \in (0, R_0)$ and $f \in L^2(B(x_0, r))$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, r) \times B(x_0, r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq C(1-s) \int_{B(x_0, r) \times B(x_0, r)} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $B = B(x_0, r)$ be an open ball in M with $r \in (0, R_0)$ and $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For all $x, y \in B$ and $z \in B(y, d(x, y)/2)$, we have

$$\frac{2}{3}d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) \leq 2d(x, z) \quad \text{and} \quad d(x, y) \geq 2d(y, z). \quad (3.2)$$

Using (3.2), VD^* , Fubini's theorem and the symmetry of J in the second inequality below, and $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ in the third, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B \times B} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq 2 \int_{B \times B} \int_{B(y, d(x, y)/2)} \frac{((f(x) - f(z))^2 + (f(y) - f(z))^2)}{V(y, d(x, y)/2)} \mu(dz) J(x, dy) \mu(dx) \\ & \leq c_1 \int_{B \times B} \frac{(f(x) - f(z))^2}{V(x, d(x, z))} \int_{B \setminus B(x, 2d(x, z)/3)} J(x, dy) \mu(dx) \mu(dz) \\ & \quad + 2 \int_{B \times B} \frac{(f(y) - f(z))^2}{V(y, d(y, z))} \int_{B \setminus B(y, 2d(y, z))} J(y, dx) \mu(dy) \mu(dz) \\ & \leq c_2 \Lambda(1-s) \int_{B \times B} \frac{(f(x) - f(z))^2}{V(x, d(x, z))d(x, z)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ hold. There exists $C > 1$ independent of s such that*

$$C^{-1}\mathcal{E}_1^s(f, f) \leq \mathcal{E}_1(f, f) \leq C\mathcal{E}_1^s(f, f) \quad \text{for all } f \in L^2(M).$$

Proof. Let $K_0 \geq 1$ be the constant in $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$. Set $r := 1 \wedge (R_0/(3K_0))$. By Lemma 3.1, there exist $N_0 = N_0(K_0) \in \mathbb{N}$ and an open covering $\{B(z_i, r)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of M such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathbf{1}_{B(z_i, 2K_0 r)} \leq N_0 \quad \text{on } M. \quad (3.3)$$

Let $f \in L^2(M)$. Since $\{B(z_i, r)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is an open covering, we have

$$\mathcal{E}^s(f, f) \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_{B(z_i, r) \times M} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_s(x, y) \mu(dy) \mu(dx). \quad (3.4)$$

By Proposition 2.7(i), $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ and (3.3), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_{B(z_i, r) \times B(z_i, 2r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_s(x, y) \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \\ & \leq c_1 \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_{B(z_i, 2K_0 r) \times B(z_i, 2K_0 r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \leq c_2 N_0 \mathcal{E}(f, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

On the other hand, using the Cauchy inequality and Fubini's theorem in the first inequality below, (3.3) and the symmetry of J_s in the second, and Corollary 2.8 in the third, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_{B(z_i, r) \times B(z_i, 2r)^c} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_s(x, y) \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_{B(z_i, r)} f(x)^2 \int_{B(x, r)^c} J_s(x, y) \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \\ & \quad + 2 \int_M f(y)^2 \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_{B(z_i, r) \setminus B(y, r)} J_s(y, x) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ & \leq 4N_0 \int_M f(x)^2 \mu(dx) \sup_{z \in M} \int_{B(z, r)^c} J_s(z, y) \mu(dy) \\ & \leq c_2 N_0 (1-s) r^{-\beta s} \|f\|_2^2 \leq c_2 N_0 (1-s) r^{-\beta} \|f\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Combining (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), we arrive at $\mathcal{E}^s(f, f) \leq c_3 \mathcal{E}_1(f, f)$. Similarly, using $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and Proposition 3.2 in place of Corollary 2.8 and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ respectively and repeating the preceding argument, we can establish $\mathcal{E}(f, f) \leq c_4 \mathcal{E}_1^s(f, f)$. \square

Corollary 3.4. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ hold. Then $\mathcal{F}_D = \mathcal{F}_D^s$ for any open set $D \subset M$. In particular, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^s = W^{\beta s/2, 2}$ and $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(M)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_D^s$. Since $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}_D^s)$ is regular, there exists a \mathcal{E}_1^s -Cauchy sequence $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in $C_c(D) \cap \mathcal{F}^s$ converging to f in \mathcal{E}_1^s -norm. By Proposition 3.3, $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a \mathcal{E}_1 -Cauchy sequence in $C_c(D)$ that converges to f in \mathcal{E}_1 -norm. Hence, we get $f \in \mathcal{F}_D$, implying that $\mathcal{F}_D^s \subset \mathcal{F}_D$. Similarly, we can deduce that $\mathcal{F}_D \subset \mathcal{F}_D^s$. Hence, $\mathcal{F}_D = \mathcal{F}_D^s$. Now by letting $D = M$, we obtain $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^s = W^{\beta s/2, 2}$. Since \mathcal{F} is non-empty, $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(M)$. \square

By Propositions 2.11 and 2.14, and Corollary 3.4, we get the next proposition.

Proposition 3.5. *If $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ hold, then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies $\text{rFK}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rPI}_\beta(s)$.*

In the remainder of this section, we establish $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ under $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$. The verification of $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ is challenging since we cannot generally expect a pointwise bound for the integral $\int_M (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy)$ that appears in $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$. Note that $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ allows us to compare double integrals only, and the constant K_0 in $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ can be strictly larger than 1. To address these issues, we use a covering argument to manage the constant K_0 and take advantage of the fact that the cutoff $\phi \in \mathcal{F}^s$ used in $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ for $(\mathcal{E}^s, \mathcal{F}^s)$ is almost radial.

We begin with the next lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ hold. There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that for all $x_0 \in M$, $R > 0$, $r \in (0, R_0/2)$ and $f \in L^2(B(x_0, R+r))$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & (1-s) \int_{B(x_0, R) \times B(x_0, R)} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B(x_0, R+r) \times B(x_0, R+r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{1-s}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{B(x_0, R)} f^2 d\mu \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, R) \times B(x_0, R)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq C \left((1-s) \int_{B(x_0, R+r) \times B(x_0, R+r)} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) + \frac{1-s}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{B(x_0, R)} f^2 d\mu \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. Let $K_0 \geq 1$ be constant in $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$. Set

$$E_1 := \{(x, y) \in B(x_0, R) \times B(x_0, R) : d(x, y) < r/(4K_0)\}$$

and $E_2 := (B(x_0, R) \times B(x_0, R)) \setminus E_1$. By Lemma 3.1, there exist $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and an open covering $\{B(z_i, r/(4K_0))\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of M such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathbf{1}_{B(z_i, r/2)} \leq N_0 \text{ on } M. \quad (3.9)$$

Since $\{B(z_i, r/(4K_0))\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is an open covering of M , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1-s) \int_{E_1} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ & \leq (1-s) \sum_{i: B(z_i, r/(4K_0)) \cap B(x_0, R) \neq \emptyset} \int_{B(z_i, r/(4K_0))} \int_{B(x, r/(4K_0))} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \\ & \leq (1-s) \sum_{i: z_i \in B(x_0, R+r/4)} \int_{B(z_i, r/(2K_0)) \times B(z_i, r/(2K_0))} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, applying $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ and using (3.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (1-s) \int_{E_1} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ & \leq c_1 \sum_{i: z_i \in B(x_0, R+r/2)} \int_{B(z_i, r/2) \times B(z_i, r/2)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq c_1 N_0 \int_{B(x_0, R+r) \times B(x_0, R+r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

On the other hand, since $V(x, d(x, y)) \asymp V(y, d(x, y))$ for all $x, y \in M$ by VD^* , using Lemma 2.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-s) \int_{E_2} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
& \leq c_2(1-s) \int_{B(x_0, R)} f(x)^2 \int_{B(x, r/(4K_0))^c} \frac{\mu(dy)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \\
& \leq \frac{c_3(1-s)}{\beta s(r/(4K_0))^{\beta s}} \int_{B(x_0, R)} f^2 d\mu \leq \frac{c_3(1-s)(4K_0)^\beta}{\beta s_0 r^{\beta s}} \int_{B(x_0, R)} f^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Combining (3.10) with (3.11), we deduce that (3.7) holds.

Similarly, following the arguments for (3.7) and using Proposition 3.2, we obtain (3.8). \square

Note that, by Corollary 3.4, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^s$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b^s$.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ hold. There exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of s such that the following holds: Let $x_0 \in M$ and $R, r > 0$ be such that $R + 2r < R_0$. There exists a cutoff function $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ for $B(x_0, R) \Subset B(x_0, R + r)$ such that for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B(x_0, R+2r) \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
& \leq C_1(1-s) \int_{B(x_0, R+2r) \times B(x_0, R+2r)} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
& \quad + 2 \int_{B(x_0, R+2r) \times B(x_0, R+2r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{C_2}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{B(x_0, R+2r)} f^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define $U_a := B(x_0, R + ar)$ for $a \geq 0$. By Proposition 2.18, since $\mathcal{F}^s = \mathcal{F}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^s = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, there exist constants $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$ independent of s, x_0, R and r , and a cutoff function $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ for $U_0 \Subset U_1$ such that for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-s) \int_{U_2 \times M} \frac{f(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
& \leq c_1(1-s) \int_{U_1 \times U_2} \frac{\phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) + \frac{c_2}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Since ϕ is a cutoff function for $U_0 \Subset U_1$, using $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, we get that for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{U_2 \times U_2^c} f(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) = \int_{U_2 \times U_2^c} f(x)^2 \phi(x)^2 J(dx, dy) \\
& \leq \int_{U_1} f(x)^2 J(x, B(x, r)^c) \mu(dx) \leq \frac{c_3(1-s)}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_1} f^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Besides, using Lemma 3.6 (with R replaced by $R + 2r$), since $\phi^2 \leq 1$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{U_2 \times U_2} f(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
& \leq 2 \int_{U_2 \times U_2} ((f(x)\phi(x) - f(y)\phi(y))^2 + \phi(y)^2 (f(y) - f(x))^2) J(dx, dy) \\
& \leq c_4(1-s) \int_{U_3 \times U_3} \frac{(f(x)\phi(x) - f(y)\phi(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) + \frac{c_5(1-s)}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu \\
& \quad + 2 \int_{U_2 \times U_2} (f(y) - f(x))^2 J(dx, dy).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Applying (3.12) and using $\phi^2 \leq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-s) \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \frac{(f(x)\phi(x) - f(y)\phi(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\
& \leq 2(1-s) \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \frac{(f(x)(\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 + \phi(y)(f(x) - f(y))^2)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\
& \leq 2c_1(1-s) \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) + \frac{2c_2}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu \\
& \quad + 2(1-s) \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy). \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

By VD*, $V(x, d(x, y)) \asymp V(y, d(x, y))$ for all $x, y \in M$. Using this and the fact that $\phi = 0$ in U_1^c in the first inequality below, $\phi^2 \leq 1$ in the second and Lemma 2.6 in the third, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-s) \int_{(U_3 \times U_3) \setminus (U_2 \times U_2)} \frac{(f(x)\phi(x) - f(y)\phi(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\
& \leq c_6(1-s) \int_{U_1 \times U_2^c} \frac{f(x)^2 \phi(x)^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\
& \leq c_6(1-s) \int_{U_1} f(x)^2 \int_{B(x, r)^c} \frac{\mu(dy)}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \\
& \leq \frac{c_7(1-s)}{\beta s_0 r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_1} f^2 d\mu. \tag{3.16}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.13), (3.14), (3.15) and (3.16), we arrive at the result. \square

The proof of the next proposition is motivated by [29, Lemma 2.9] and [21, Proposition 2.4]. However, unlike in [29, 21], since we do not assume the existence and pointwise estimates for the density of the jump kernel $J(dx, dy)$, non-trivial modifications are required.

Proposition 3.8. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ hold. Then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$.*

Proof. Let $x_0 \in M$ and $R, r > 0$ be such that $R + 2r < R_0$. Write $U_a := B(x_0, R + ar)$ for $a \geq 0$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\lambda = \lambda(\varepsilon) > 0$ be a constant to be determined later. Define $c_0 := 1 - e^{-\lambda/\beta}$,

$$a_n := c_0 e^{-\lambda(n-1)/\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad b_n := \sum_{m=1}^n a_m, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Note that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 1$. By Lemma 3.7, there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of s, x_0, R, r and λ such that for each $n \geq 1$, there exists a cutoff function $\phi_n \in \mathcal{F}$ for $U_{b_n - a_{n+1}} \Subset U_{b_n}$ so that for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{U_{b_{n+1}} \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
& \leq C_1(1-s) \int_{U_{b_{n+1}} \times U_{b_{n+1}}} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\
& \quad + 2 \int_{U_{b_{n+1}} \times U_{b_{n+1}}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{C_2 e^{s\lambda n}}{(c_0 r)^{\beta s}} \int_{U_{b_{n+1}}} f^2 d\mu. \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\phi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (e^{-\lambda(n-1)} - e^{-\lambda n}) \phi_n.$$

Then $\phi \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (e^{-\lambda(n-1)} - e^{-\lambda n}) = 1$ in M , $\phi = 0$ in U_1^c and for every $k \geq 0$,

$$\phi \geq \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} (e^{-\lambda(n-1)} - e^{-\lambda n}) \phi_n = \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} (e^{-\lambda(n-1)} - e^{-\lambda n}) = e^{-\lambda k} \quad \text{on } U_{b_k}. \quad (3.18)$$

In particular, ϕ is a cutoff function for $U_0 \Subset U_1$. Further, for each $n \geq 1$, applying (3.17) with $f = 1$, we get

$$\mathcal{E}(\phi_n, \phi_n) \leq 2 \int_{U_{b_n} \times M} (\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \leq \frac{C_2 \mu(U_2) e^{s\lambda n}}{(c_0 r)^{\beta s}}.$$

Using this, since $\phi_n^2 \leq 1$ and $s < 1$, we get that for all $N, k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_1 \left(\sum_{n=N+1}^{N+k} (e^{-\lambda(n-1)} - e^{-\lambda n}) \phi_n, \sum_{n=N+1}^{N+k} (e^{-\lambda(n-1)} - e^{-\lambda n}) \phi_n \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \sum_{n=N+1}^{N+k} (e^{-\lambda(n-1)} - e^{-\lambda n}) \mathcal{E}_1(\phi_n, \phi_n)^{1/2} \leq \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda(n-1)} \left(\frac{C_2 \mu(U_2) e^{s\lambda n}}{(c_0 r)^{\beta s}} + \mu(U_2) \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq e^{\lambda} \mu(U_2)^{1/2} \left(\frac{C_2}{(c_0 r)^{\beta s}} + 1 \right)^{1/2} \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda n/2} = \frac{e^{\lambda} \mu(U_2)^{1/2}}{e^{\lambda/2} - 1} \left(\frac{C_2}{(c_0 r)^{\beta s}} + 1 \right)^{1/2} e^{-\lambda N/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(\sum_{n=1}^k (e^{-\lambda(n-1)} - e^{-\lambda n}) \phi_n)_{k \geq 1}$ is a \mathcal{E}_1 -Cauchy sequence, implying $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$.

Now, we show that ϕ satisfies (1.6). Let $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{U_2 \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & = 2(e^{\lambda} - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=n+2}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda(n+m)} \int_{U_2 \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y)) (\phi_m(x) - \phi_m(y)) J(dx, dy) \\ & \quad + 2(e^{\lambda} - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda(2n+1)} \int_{U_2 \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y)) (\phi_{n+1}(x) - \phi_{n+1}(y)) J(dx, dy) \\ & \quad + (e^{\lambda} - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\lambda n} \int_{U_2 \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

For $n \geq 1$ and $m \geq n+2$, we see that $(\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y))(\phi_m(x) - \phi_m(y)) \neq 0$ only if $x \in U_{b_n}$ and $y \in U_{b_{n+1}}^c$, or $x \in U_{b_{n+1}}^c$ and $y \in U_{b_n}$. Thus, for any $n \geq 1$ and $m \geq n+2$, $(\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y))(\phi_m(x) - \phi_m(y)) \neq 0$ only if $x \in U_{b_n}$ and $y \in U_{b_{n+1}}^c$, or $x \in U_{b_{n+1}}^c$ and $y \in U_{b_n}$.

$\phi_m(y)) \neq 0$ only if $d(x, y) \geq a_{n+1}r$. Using this property and $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq 2(e^\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=n+2}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda(n+m)} \int_{U_2} f(x)^2 J(x, B(x, a_{n+1}r)^c) \mu(dx) \\
&\leq \frac{c_1(1-s)(e^\lambda - 1)^2}{(c_0r)^{\beta s}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=n+2}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda(n+m-sn)} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu \\
&\leq \frac{c_1(e^\lambda - 1)^2}{c_0^\beta r^{\beta s}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=n+2}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda m} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu \\
&= \frac{c_1(e^\lambda - 1)}{e^\lambda c_0^\beta r^{\beta s}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda n} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu = \frac{c_1}{e^\lambda c_0^\beta r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

By the Cauchy inequality, $I_2 \leq 2I_3$. For each n , since $\phi_n = 0$ in $U_{b_n}^c$, by $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{(U_2 \setminus U_{b_{n+1}}) \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y))^2 J(dx, dy) = \int_{(U_2 \setminus U_{b_{n+1}}) \times U_{b_n}} f(x)^2 \phi_n(y)^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&\leq \int_{U_2 \setminus U_{b_{n+1}}} f(x)^2 J(x, B(x, a_{n+1}r)^c) \mu(dx) \leq \frac{c_2(1-s)e^{s\lambda n}}{(c_0r)^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Further, applying Lemma 3.6 with R replaced by $R + b_n r$ and r by $a_{n+2}r$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-s) \int_{U_{b_{n+1}} \times U_{b_{n+1}}} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
&\leq c_3 \int_{U_{b_{n+2}} \times U_{b_{n+2}}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{(1-s)e^{s\lambda(n+1)}}{(c_0r)^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Combining (3.17), (3.20) and (3.21), we deduce that for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{U_2 \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&\leq c_4 \left(\int_{U_{b_{n+2}} \times U_{b_{n+2}}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{e^{s\lambda(n+1)}}{(c_0r)^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &\leq c_4(e^\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\lambda n} \int_{U_{b_{n+2}} \times U_{b_{n+2}}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&\quad + c_4 e^{s\lambda} (e^\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-(2-s)\lambda n}}{(c_0r)^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu \\
&=: I_{3,1} + I_{3,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$I_{3,2} \leq \frac{c_4 e^\lambda (e^\lambda - 1)^2}{c_0^\beta r^{\beta s}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda n} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu = \frac{c_4 e^\lambda (e^\lambda - 1)}{c_0^\beta r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu. \tag{3.22}$$

For $I_{3,1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{3,1} &\leq c_4(e^\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\lambda n} \int_{U_0 \times U_{b_{n+2}}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&\quad + c_4(e^\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n+2} e^{-2\lambda n} \int_{(U_{b_k} \setminus U_{b_{k-1}}) \times U_{b_{n+2}}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&=: c_4(I'_{3,1} + I'_{3,2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Since $\phi = 1$ in U_0 , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
I'_{3,1} &\leq (e^\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\lambda n} \int_{U_0 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&= \frac{(e^\lambda - 1)}{e^\lambda + 1} \int_{U_0 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Moreover, by (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I'_{3,2} &\leq (e^\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n+2} e^{-2\lambda(n-k)} \int_{(U_{b_k} \setminus U_{b_{k-1}}) \times U_{b_{n+2}}} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&\leq (e^\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{2\lambda k} \int_{(U_{b_k} \setminus U_{b_{k-1}}) \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \sum_{n=k-2}^{\infty} e^{-2\lambda n} \\
&= \frac{(e^\lambda - 1)e^{6\lambda}}{e^\lambda + 1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{(U_{b_k} \setminus U_{b_{k-1}}) \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&= \frac{(e^\lambda - 1)e^{6\lambda}}{e^\lambda + 1} \int_{(U_1 \setminus U_0) \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Since $I_2 \leq 2I_3$, by (3.22), (3.23), (3.24) and (3.25), we deduce that

$$I_2 + I_3 \leq \frac{3c_4(e^\lambda - 1)e^{6\lambda}}{e^\lambda + 1} \int_{U_1 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{3c_4e^\lambda(e^\lambda - 1)}{c_0^\beta r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu.$$

Combining this with (3.19), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{U_2 \times M} f(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\
&\leq \frac{3c_4(e^\lambda - 1)e^{6\lambda}}{e^\lambda + 1} \int_{U_1 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{c_1 + 3c_4e^\lambda(e^\lambda - 1)}{c_0^\beta r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} f^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} 3c_4(e^a - 1)e^{6a}/(e^a + 1) = 0$. By choosing λ such that $3c_4(e^\lambda - 1)e^{6\lambda}/(e^\lambda + 1) = \varepsilon$, we conclude that (1.6) holds. The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.9. The result follows from Corollary 3.4, and Propositions 3.5 and 3.8. \square

4 L^2 -mean value inequality for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$

In Sections 4 and 5, we assume that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a pure-jump type regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(M)$ with the representation (1.3). In this section, we establish the L^2 -mean value inequality for subsolutions associated with $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ (Proposition 4.5). We mainly follow the strategy of [21, Section 4].

The next lemma follows from [29, Lemma 3.2(i)].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $D \subset M$ be a non-empty bounded open set and $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a twice differentiable function such that $F'' \geq 0$ and $\sup_{\mathbb{R}} |F'| + \sup_{\mathbb{R}} F'' < \infty$. Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{F}_D^{\text{loc}}$ is locally bounded in D and satisfies (1.9). Then for any $0 \leq \phi \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_c(D)$, $\mathcal{E}(F \circ u, \phi)$ and $\mathcal{E}(u, (F' \circ u)\phi)$ are absolutely convergent and*

$$\mathcal{E}(F \circ u, \phi) \leq \mathcal{E}(u, (F' \circ u)\phi). \quad (4.1)$$

We establish a robust version of Caccioppoli-type inequality. Note that a non-robust version was previously established in [21, Lemma 4.6].

Recall that the nonlocal tail $\mathcal{T}(u, D_1, D_2)$ of u is defined as (1.10).

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ hold. There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that the following holds: For any $x_0 \in M$ and $R, r > 0$ satisfying $R + 2r < R_0$, there exists a cutoff function $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ for $B(x_0, R) \Subset B(x_0, R+r)$ such that if u is bounded in $B(x_0, R+2r)$ and $-\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in $B(x_0, R+2r)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R+2r))$, then for all $\theta_0 \geq 0$ and $\theta_1 > \theta_0 + r^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R+2r))}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, R+2r) \times M} (\phi(x)(u(x) - \theta_1)_+ - \phi(y)(u(y) - \theta_1)_+)^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq \left(\frac{C}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{18\mathcal{T}(u_+, B(x_0, R+r), B(x_0, R+2r)^c)}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right) \int_{B(x_0, R+2r)} (u(x) - \theta_0)_+^2 d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define $U_a := B(x_0, R+ar)$ for $a \geq 0$. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ be a cutoff function for $U_0 \Subset U_1$ satisfying (1.6) with $\varepsilon = 1/8$. Denote $T := \mathcal{T}(u_+, U_1, U_2^c)$, $v := (u - \theta_1)_+$ and $w := (u - \theta_0)_+$. Since $u \in \mathcal{F}_{U_2}^{\text{loc}} \cap L^\infty(U_2)$, we have $v \in \mathcal{F}_{U_2}^{\text{loc}} \cap L^\infty(U_2)$. Hence, there exists $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{F}_b$ such that $v = \tilde{v}$ in U_1 . By [27, Theorem 1.4.2], $v\phi^2 = \tilde{v}\phi^2 \in \mathcal{F}_{U_1} \cap L^\infty(M)$. Since $-\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in U_2 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{U_1} f v \phi^2 d\mu & \geq \mathcal{E}(u, v\phi^2) = \int_{U_2 \times U_2} (u(x) - u(y))(v(x)\phi(x)^2 - v(y)\phi(y)^2) J(dx, dy) \\ & \quad + 2 \int_{U_1 \times U_2^c} (u(x) - u(y))v(x)\phi(x)^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

For all $x \in U_1$, if $u(x) \leq \theta_1$, then $f(x)v(x)\phi(x)^2 = 0$ and if $u(x) > \theta_1$, then

$$f(x)v(x)\phi(x)^2 \leq \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(U_2)}v(x) \leq r^{-\beta s}(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(u(x) - \theta_1) \leq r^{-\beta s}w(x)^2.$$

Thus, $f(x)v(x)\phi(x)^2 \leq r^{-\beta s}w(x)^2$ for all $x \in U_1$, implying that

$$\int_{U_1} f v \phi^2 d\mu \leq \frac{1}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_1} w^2 d\mu. \quad (4.3)$$

For I_1 , following the argument in [21, p.36], we get

$$I_1 \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (v(x) - v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) - 2 \int_{U_2 \times U_2} v(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy). \quad (4.4)$$

For I_2 , we note that for all $x \in U_1$ and $y \in U_2^c$, if $u(x) \geq u(y)$ or $u(x) < \theta_1$, then $(u(x) - u(y))v(x)\phi(x)^2 \geq 0$, and if $u(y) > u(x) \geq \theta_1$, then

$$(u(x) - u(y))v(x)\phi(x)^2 \geq -u(y)(u(x) - \theta_1) \geq -\frac{u_+(y)w(x)^2}{\theta_1 - \theta_0}.$$

Consequently, it holds that

$$I_2 \geq -2 \int_{U_1} \frac{w(x)^2}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \int_{U_2^c} u_+(y)J(x, y)\mu(dy) \mu(dx) \geq -\frac{2T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \int_{U_1} w^2 d\mu. \quad (4.5)$$

Combining (4.2), (4.3), (4.4) and (4.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (v(x) - v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq 2 \int_{U_2 \times U_2} v(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \left(\frac{1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{2T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right) \int_{U_1} w^2 d\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

By the symmetry of J , since $\phi = 0$ in U_2^c , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{9} \int_{U_2 \times M} (\phi(x)v(x) - \phi(y)v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & = \frac{2}{9} \int_{U_2 \times M} v(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{2}{9} \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (v(x) - v(y))^2 J(dx, dy). \end{aligned}$$

Using this in the first inequality below, (1.6) (with $f = v$ and $\varepsilon = 1/8$) in the second, and (4.6) and $v^2 \leq w^2$ in the last, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{9} \int_{U_2 \times M} (\phi(x)v(x) - \phi(y)v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq \frac{2}{9} \int_{U_2 \times M} v(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{2}{9} \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (v(x) - v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{U_2 \times U_2} \phi(x)^2 (v(x) - v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \frac{c_1}{r^{\beta s}} \int_{U_2} v^2 d\mu - 2 \int_{U_2 \times M} v(x)^2 (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \\ & \leq \left(\frac{c_1 + 1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{2T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right) \int_{U_2} w^2 d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

The proof of the next lemma is originally due to [28, Lemma 3.2].

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, $\text{rFK}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ hold. There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that the following holds: Let $x_0 \in M$ and $0 < r \leq R$ be such that $R + 2r < R_0/2$. Suppose that u is bounded in $B(x_0, R + 2r)$ and $-\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in $B(x_0, R + 2r)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R + 2r))$. For given $\theta_0 \geq 0$ and $\theta_1 > \theta_0 + r^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R + 2r))}$, define*

$$\mathcal{I}_0 := \int_{B(x_0, R + 2r)} (u - \theta_0)_+^2 d\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_1 := \int_{B(x_0, R)} (u - \theta_1)_+^2 d\mu.$$

Then we have

$$\mathcal{I}_1 \leq \frac{CR^{\beta s}}{(\theta_1 - \theta_0)^{2\beta s/\alpha} V(x_0, R + 2r)^{\beta s/\alpha}} \left[\frac{1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{\mathcal{T}(u_+, B(x_0, R + r), B(x_0, R + 2r)^c)}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right] \mathcal{I}_0^{1+\beta s/\alpha}.$$

Proof. Write $U_a := B(x_0, R + ar)$ for $a \geq 0$. Denote $w := (u - \theta_0)_+$, $v := (u - \theta_1)_+$ and $T := \mathcal{T}(u_+, U_1, U_2^c)$. By Lemma 4.2, there exists a cutoff function ϕ for $U_0 \Subset U_1$ such that

$$\int_{U_2 \times M} (\phi(x)v(x) - \phi(y)v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \leq \left(\frac{c_1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{18T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right) \mathcal{I}_0. \quad (4.7)$$

Let

$$E := \{x \in U_1 : v(x) > 0\} = \{x \in U_1 : u(x) > \theta_1\}.$$

If $\mu(E) = 0$, then $\mathcal{I}_1 = 0$ and the desired inequality is evident. Suppose that $\mu(E) > 0$. By the outer regularity of μ , there is an open set D such that $E \subset D \subset U_2$ and $\mu(D) \leq 2\mu(E)$. By the Markov's inequality, it follows that

$$\mu(D) \leq 2\mu(E) \leq 2 \int_E \frac{(u(x) - \theta_0)_+^2}{(\theta_1 - \theta_0)^2} \mu(dx) \leq \frac{2\mathcal{I}_0}{(\theta_1 - \theta_0)^2}. \quad (4.8)$$

Since $\phi v \in \mathcal{F}_D$ and $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies rFK $_{\beta}(s)$ (with $K_2 \geq 1$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\phi v\|_2^2 \left(\frac{V(x_0, R + 2r)}{\mu(D)} \right)^{\beta s / \alpha} \\ & \leq c_2 \left((3R)^{\beta s} \int_{B(x_0, K_2 R + 2K_2 r) \times B(x_0, K_2 R + 2K_2 r)} (\phi(x)v(x) - \phi(y)v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) + \|\phi v\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $\phi = 0$ in U_1^c , using the symmetry of J , (4.7) and rTJ $_{\beta}(s)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\phi v\|_2^2 \left(\frac{V(x_0, R + 2r)}{\mu(D)} \right)^{\beta s / \alpha} \\ & \leq c_2 \left[(3R)^{\beta s} \int_{U_2 \times U_2} (\phi(x)v(x) - \phi(y)v(y))^2 J(dx, dy) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2(3R)^{\beta s} \int_{U_1} \phi(x)^2 v(x)^2 \int_{U_2^c} J(x, dy) \mu(dx) + \|\phi v\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 3^{\beta} c_2 \left[R^{\beta s} \left(\frac{c_1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{18T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right) \mathcal{I}_0 + 2R^{\beta s} \int_{U_1} \phi(x)^2 v(x)^2 \int_{B(x, r)^c} J(x, dy) \mu(dx) + \|\phi v\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 3^{\beta} c_2 R^{\beta s} \left[\left(\frac{c_1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{18T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right) \mathcal{I}_0 + \left(\frac{c_3(1-s) + 1}{r^{\beta s}} \right) \|\phi v\|_2^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Since $\phi = 1$ in U_0 and $\phi^2 v^2 \leq w^2$, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \int_{U_0} \phi^2 v^2 d\mu \leq \|\phi v\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{I}_0. \quad (4.10)$$

Combining (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 & \leq \|\phi v\|_2^2 \leq 3^{\beta} c_2 R^{\beta s} \left(\frac{\mu(D)}{V(x_0, R + 2r)} \right)^{\beta s / \alpha} \left[\left(\frac{c_1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{18T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right) \mathcal{I}_0 + \left(\frac{c_3(1-s) + 1}{r^{\beta s}} \right) \|\phi v\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 3^{\beta} c_2 R^{\beta s} \left(\frac{2\mathcal{I}_0}{(\theta_1 - \theta_0)^2 V(x_0, R + 2r)} \right)^{\beta s / \alpha} \left[\frac{c_1 + c_3 + 1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{18T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right] \mathcal{I}_0 \\ & \leq \frac{2^{\beta / \alpha} 3^{\beta} c_2 R^{\beta s}}{(\theta_1 - \theta_0)^{2\beta s / \alpha} V(x_0, R + 2r)^{\beta s / \alpha}} \left[\frac{c_1 + c_3 + 1}{r^{\beta s}} + \frac{18T}{\theta_1 - \theta_0} \right] \mathcal{I}_0^{1 + \beta s / \alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We recall the following elementary iteration lemma from [21, Lemma 4.9].

Lemma 4.4. Let $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers such that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$a_{n+1} \leq c_0 b^n a_n^{1+\varepsilon},$$

for some constants $\varepsilon > 0$, $b > 1$ and $c_0 > 0$. If $a_0 \leq c_0^{-1/\varepsilon} b^{-1/\varepsilon^2}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$.

We now establish the L^2 -mean value inequality for subsolutions.

Proposition 4.5. Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, $\text{rFK}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ hold. There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that the following holds: Let $x_0 \in M$ and $0 < R < R_0/2$. Suppose that u is bounded in $B(x_0, R)$ and $-\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in $B(x_0, R)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$. Then for all $\delta > 0$ and $q \in [0, \beta]$, it holds that

$$\text{ess sup}_{B(x_0, R/2)} u \leq C \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{\alpha/(2\beta s)} \mathcal{I}^{1/2} + \delta \mathcal{T}_q + R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} \right],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &= \mathcal{I}(u, x_0, R) := \frac{1}{V(x_0, R)} \int_{B(x_0, R)} u^2 d\mu, \\ \mathcal{T}_q &= \mathcal{T}_q(u, x_0, R) := \sup \left\{ \frac{a^q \mathcal{T}(u_+, B(x_0, r), B(x_0, r+a)^c)}{R^{q-\beta s}} : r \in [R/2, R], a \in (0, R/8] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. Fix $\delta > 0$ and $q \in [0, \beta]$. Set $\nu := \beta s / \alpha$ and let $\theta > R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))}$ be a constant to be determined later. For $n \geq 0$, define

$$r_n = \frac{1}{2}(1 + 2^{-n})R, \quad \theta_n = \sum_{j=0}^n 2^{-j\beta s} \theta \quad \text{and} \quad a_n = \int_{B(x_0, r_n)} (u - \theta_n)_+^2 d\mu.$$

For all $n \geq 0$, we have

$$\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n = 2^{-(n+1)\beta s} \theta > 2^{-(n+1)\beta s} R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} > (r_n - r_{n+1})^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))}.$$

Applying Lemma 4.3 (with $R = r_{n+1}$, $r = (r_n - r_{n+1})/2$, $\theta_1 = \theta_{n+1}$ and $\theta_0 = \theta_n$) and using VD, we get that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n+1} &\leq \frac{c_1 r_{n+1}^{\beta s}}{(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)^{2\nu} V(x_0, r_n)^\nu} \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{2^{\beta s}}{(r_n - r_{n+1})^{\beta s}} + \frac{\mathcal{T}(u_+, B(x_0, (r_n + r_{n+1})/2), B(x_0, r_n)^c)}{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n} \right] a_n^{1+\nu} \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 r_{n+1}^{\beta s}}{(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)^{2\nu} V(x_0, R/2)^\nu} \left[\frac{2^{\beta s}}{(r_n - r_{n+1})^{\beta s}} + \frac{R^{q-\beta s} \mathcal{T}_q}{(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)((r_n - r_{n+1})/2)^q} \right] a_n^{1+\nu} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{2\nu\alpha+2\nu\beta s(n+1)} c_2 R^{\beta s}}{\theta^{2\nu} V(x_0, R)^\nu} \left[\frac{2^{\beta s(n+3)}}{R^{\beta s}} + \frac{2^{\beta s(n+1)+q(n+3)} \mathcal{T}_q}{\theta R^{\beta s}} \right] a_n^{1+\nu} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{2\nu\alpha+2\nu\beta s+3\beta s+3q} c_2}{\theta^{2\nu} V(x_0, R)^\nu} \left[1 + \frac{\mathcal{T}_q}{\theta} \right] 2^{(2\nu\beta s+\beta s+q)n} a_n^{1+\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $c_2 \geq 1$. Set $b := 2^{2\nu\beta s+\beta s+q}$, $c_3 := 2^{2\nu\alpha+2\nu\beta s+3\beta s+3q} c_2$,

$$\theta := \left(\frac{c_3^{1/\nu} b^{1/\nu^2} (1 + \delta^{-1})^{1/\nu} a_0}{V(x_0, R)} \right)^{1/2} + \delta \mathcal{T}_q + R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))}$$

and

$$c_0 := \frac{c_3}{\theta^{2\nu} V(x_0, R)^\nu} \left[1 + \frac{\mathcal{T}_q}{\theta} \right].$$

By (4.12), $a_{n+1} \leq c_0 b^n a_n^{1+\nu}$ for all $n \geq 0$. Moreover, it holds that

$$c_0^{-1/\nu} b^{-1/\nu^2} = c_3^{-1/\nu} b^{-1/\nu^2} \frac{\theta^2 V(x_0, R)}{(1 + \mathcal{T}_q/\theta)^{1/\nu}} \geq \frac{(1 + \delta^{-1})^{1/\nu} a_0}{(1 + \mathcal{T}_q/\theta)^{1/\nu}} \geq \frac{(1 + \delta^{-1})^{1/\nu} a_0}{(1 + \delta^{-1})^{1/\nu}} = a_0.$$

Thus, by Lemma 4.4, we obtain $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$ which implies $\text{ess sup}_{B(x_0, R/2)} u \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j\beta s} \theta = 2^{\beta s} \theta / (2^{\beta s} - 1)$. Since $a_0 \leq \mathcal{I}^2 V(x_0, R)$, by the definition of θ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess sup}_{B(x_0, R/2)} u \\ & \leq \frac{2^\beta}{2^{\beta s_0} - 1} \left[\left(2^{7\alpha + 2\beta + 3\alpha/s_0 + \alpha^2/(\beta s_0) + \alpha^2/(\beta s_0^2)} (1 + \delta^{-1})^{1/\nu} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{I} + \delta \mathcal{T}_q + R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 4.6. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, $\text{rFK}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ hold. There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that the following holds: Let $x_0 \in M$ and $0 < R < R_0/2$. Suppose that u is bounded in $B(x_0, R)$ and $-\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in $B(x_0, R)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$. Then for all $q \in [0, \beta]$,*

$$\text{ess sup}_{B(x_0, R/2)} u \leq C \left[\mathcal{I}^{2\beta s/(\alpha + 2\beta s)} (\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{T}_q)^{\alpha/(\alpha + 2\beta s)} + R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} \right], \quad (4.13)$$

where \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{T}_q are defined as (4.11). Additionally, if u_+ is bounded in M , then

$$\text{ess sup}_{B(x_0, R/2)} u \leq C \left[\mathcal{I}^{2\beta s/(\alpha + 2\beta s)} \left(\mathcal{I} \vee \Lambda(1 - s) \text{ess sup}_{B(x_0, R/2)^c} u_+ \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha + 2\beta s)} + R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} \right], \quad (4.14)$$

where $\Lambda > 0$ is the constant in $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$.

Proof. Set $\nu' := 2\beta s/(\alpha + 2\beta s)$. For $q \in [0, \beta]$, applying Proposition 4.5 with $\delta = (\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{T}_q)^{\nu'}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess sup}_{B(x_0, R/2)} u \leq c_1 \left((1 + \delta^{-1})^{\alpha/(2\beta s)} \mathcal{I} + \delta \mathcal{T}_q + R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} \right) \\ & \leq c_1 R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} + c_1 \begin{cases} 2^{\alpha/(2\beta s)} \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{I}^{\nu'} \mathcal{T}_q^{1-\nu'} & \text{if } \delta \geq 1, \\ 2^{\alpha/(2\beta s)} (\mathcal{T}_q/\mathcal{I})^{\nu' \alpha/(2\beta s)} \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{I}^{\nu'} \mathcal{T}_q^{1-\nu'} & \text{if } \delta < 1 \end{cases} \\ & \leq c_1 R^{\beta s} \|f_+\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} + (2^{\alpha/(2\beta s_0)} + 1) c_1 \mathcal{I}^{\nu'} (\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{T}_q)^{1-\nu'}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.13). For (4.14), we assume that $K := \text{ess sup}_{B(x_0, R/2)^c} u_+ < \infty$ and take $q = \beta s$. By $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, for all $r \in [R/2, R]$ and $a \in (0, R/8]$, we have

$$a^{\beta s} \mathcal{T}(u_+, B(x_0, r), B(x_0, r + a)^c) \leq K a^{\beta s} \sup_{x \in B(x_0, r)} \int_{B(x, a)^c} J(x, dy) \leq \Lambda(1 - s)K.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{T}_{\beta s} \leq \Lambda(1 - s)K$. From (4.13), we conclude that (4.14) holds. □

5 Regularity estimates for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$

In this section, we continue to assume that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(M)$ with the representation (1.3). The goal of this section is to establish a weak elliptic Harnack inequality (Proposition 5.5) and elliptic Hölder regularity for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ (Corollary 5.7). For this, we mainly follow the framework of [18].

5.1 $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s) + \text{rFK}_\beta(s) + \text{rCS}_\beta(s) + \text{rPI}_\beta(s) \Rightarrow \text{rWEHI}_\beta(s)$

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that $\text{rPI}_\beta(s)$ holds with K_1 . There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that the following holds: Let $x_0 \in M$, $R \in (0, R_0)$ and $r \in (0, R/(2K_1))$. Suppose that u is bounded, non-negative and $-\mathcal{L}u \geq f$ in $B(x_0, R)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$. For given $a, h > 0$ and $b > 1$, let*

$$v = v(u, a, h, b) := \left[\log \frac{a+h}{u+h} \right]_+ \wedge \log b.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, r)} (v - \bar{v}_{B(x_0, r)})^2 d\mu \\ & \leq CV(x_0, r) \left(1 + \frac{r^{\beta s} \mathcal{T}(u_-, B(x_0, 2K_1r), B(x_0, R)^c) + r^{\beta s} \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))}}{h} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Following the proof of [20, Proposition 4.13] and noting that the constants appearing in the proof are independent of s , we obtain the result. \square

Using Lemma 5.1, one can follow the proof of [18, Lemma 3.3] with careful considerations of constants and obtain

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that $\text{rPI}_\beta(s)$ holds with K_1 . There exists $C > 0$ independent of s such that the following holds: Let $x_0 \in M$, $R \in (0, R_0)$ and $r \in (0, R/(4K_1))$. Suppose that u is bounded, non-negative and $-\mathcal{L}u \geq f$ in $B(x_0, R)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$. If there exist $a > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ satisfying*

$$\mu(B(x_0, r) \cap \{u < a\}) \leq \delta V(x_0, r), \quad (5.1)$$

then for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mu \left(B(x_0, 2r) \cap \left\{ u \leq \varepsilon a - r^{\beta s} (\mathcal{T}(u_-, B(x_0, 4K_1r), B(x_0, R)^c) + \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))}) \right\} \right) \leq \frac{CV(x_0, 2r)}{(1-\delta)|\log \varepsilon|}.$$

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, $\text{rFK}_\beta(s)$, $\text{rCS}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rPI}_\beta(s)$ hold with K_1 . Let $x_0 \in M$, $R \in (0, R_0)$ and $r \in (0, R/(4K_1))$. Suppose that u is bounded, non-negative and $-\mathcal{L}u \geq f$ in $B(x_0, R)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$. If (5.1) holds for $a > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, then there exists $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\delta) \in (0, 1)$ depending on δ but independent of s, x_0, R, r, f, u and a such that*

$$\text{ess inf}_{B(x_0, r)} u \geq \varepsilon_0 a - r^{\beta s} (\mathcal{T}(u_-, B(x_0, 4K_1r), B(x_0, R)^c) + \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))}). \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. Define $B_l := B(x_0, l)$ for $l > 0$. Set

$$h := r^{\beta s} (\mathcal{T}(u_-, B(x_0, 4K_1r), B(x_0, R)^c) + \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}).$$

Let $k > 0$ be a constant to be determined later and $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a twice differentiable function with the following properties:

$$F' \leq 0, \quad F'' \geq 0, \quad \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F'(t)| + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} F''(t) < \infty, \quad (5.3)$$

$$F(t) = \frac{1}{t+k} \quad \text{for all } t > -\frac{k}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad F(t) \leq -\frac{10t}{k^2} \quad \text{for all } t \leq -\frac{k}{2}. \quad (5.4)$$

Since $-\mathcal{L}u \geq f$ in B_R and $(F' \circ u) \leq 0$, by Lemma 4.1, for any $0 \leq \phi \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_c(B_R)$,

$$\mathcal{E}(F \circ u, \phi) \leq \mathcal{E}(u, (F' \circ u)\phi) \leq \langle (F' \circ u)f\phi \rangle,$$

that is, $-\mathcal{L}(F \circ u) \leq (F' \circ u)f$ in B_R . Applying (4.13) to $F \circ u$, since $u \geq 0$ in B_r , we obtain

$$\left(\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{B_r} u + k \right)^{-1} = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{B_r} F \circ u \leq c_1 \left[\mathcal{I}^{\nu_0} (\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{T}_{\beta s})^{1-\nu_0} + (2r)^{\beta s} \|[(F' \circ u)f]_+\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \right], \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{I} := \left(\frac{1}{V(x_0, 2r)} \int_{B_{2r}} (F \circ u)^2 d\mu \right)^{1/2},$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{\beta s} := \sup \left\{ b^{\beta s} \mathcal{T}((F \circ u)_+, B(x_0, l), B(x_0, l+b)^c) : l \in [r, 2r], b \in (0, r/4] \right\}$$

and $\nu_0 := 2\beta s_0/(\alpha + 2\beta s_0)$. Since $u \geq 0$ in B_R , we have $-F' \circ u = (u+k)^{-2} \leq k^{-2}$ and $F \circ u = (u+k)^{-1} \leq k^{-1}$ in B_R . Hence, $\mathcal{I} \leq k^{-1}$ and

$$(2r)^{\beta s} \|[(F' \circ u)f]_+\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq 2^\beta r^{\beta s} k^{-2} \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq 2^\beta h k^{-2}. \quad (5.6)$$

Let $l \in [r, 2r]$ and $b \in (0, r/4]$. For all $x \in B_l$, using the fact that $u \geq 0$ in B_R and $\mathbf{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} b^{\beta s} \int_{B_{l+b}^c} F(u(y)) J(x, dy) &\leq b^{\beta s} \left(\int_{B_{l+b}^c \cap \{u > -k/2\}} \frac{J(x, dy)}{u(y) + k} + \frac{10}{k^2} \int_{B_{l+b}^c \cap \{u \leq -k/2\}} u_-(y) J(x, dy) \right) \\ &\leq b^{\beta s} \left(\frac{2}{k} \int_{B_{l+b}^c \cap \{u > -k/2\}} J(x, dy) + \frac{10}{k^2} \int_{B_R^c \cap \{u \leq -k/2\}} u_-(y) J(x, dy) \right) \\ &\leq b^{\beta s} \left(\frac{2}{k} \int_{B(x, b)^c} J(x, dy) + \frac{10}{k^2} \mathcal{T}(u_-, B_{2r}, B_R^c) \right) \leq \frac{2\Lambda(1-s)}{k} + \frac{10h}{k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $\mathcal{I} \leq k^{-1}$, we get

$$\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{T}_{\beta s} \leq \frac{1+2\Lambda}{k} + \frac{10h}{k^2}. \quad (5.7)$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be a constant whose exact value to be also determined later. Since $u \geq 0$ in B_{2r} , by Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^2 &= \frac{1}{V(x_0, 2r)} \int_{B_{2r} \cap \{u > \varepsilon a - h\}} \frac{\mu(dx)}{(u(x) + k)^2} + \frac{1}{V(x_0, 2r)} \int_{B_{2r} \cap \{u \leq \varepsilon a - h\}} \frac{\mu(dx)}{(u(x) + k)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{((\varepsilon a - h)_+ + k)^2} + \frac{\mu(B_{2r} \cap \{u \leq \varepsilon a - h\})}{k^2 V(x_0, 2r)} \leq \frac{1}{((\varepsilon a - h)_+ + k)^2} + \frac{c_2}{k^2(1-\delta)|\log \varepsilon|}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Combining (5.5), (5.6), (5.7) and (5.8), and using the inequality $(a + b)^{-1} \geq (a^{-1} \wedge b^{-1})/2$ for $a, b > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{B_r} u &\geq \frac{1}{c_1} \left(\mathcal{I}^{\nu_0} (\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{T}_{\beta s})^{1-\nu_0} + 2^\beta h k^{-2} \right)^{-1} - k \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2c_1} \left[\frac{k^2}{2^\beta h} \wedge \left(\frac{1}{((\varepsilon a - h)_+ + k)^2} + \frac{c_2}{k^2(1-\delta)|\log \varepsilon|} \right)^{-\nu_0/2} \left(\frac{1+2\Lambda}{k} + \frac{10h}{k^2} \right)^{\nu_0-1} \right] - k \\
&\geq c_3 \left[\frac{k^2}{h} \wedge \left(\frac{1}{((\varepsilon a - h)_+ + k)^2} + \frac{1}{k^2(1-\delta)|\log \varepsilon|} \right)^{-\nu_0/2} \left(\frac{1}{k} + \frac{h}{k^2} \right)^{\nu_0-1} \right] - k, \tag{5.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_3 \in (0, 1)$ is a constant independent of s, x_0, R, r, f, u and a .

Now, we let $\gamma := (2^{\nu_0/2-2} c_3)^{1/\nu_0} \in (0, 1)$, and take

$$\varepsilon = \exp \left(-\frac{1}{\gamma^2(1-\delta)} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad k = \gamma \varepsilon a.$$

Set $\varepsilon_0 := 2^{-1} c_3 \gamma \varepsilon$. If $h \geq \varepsilon_0 a$, then since $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{B_r} u \geq 0$, (5.2) holds. Assume that $h < \varepsilon_0 a$. Then $c_3 k^2/h = 2\varepsilon_0 a k/h > 2k$. Moreover, since $h < k < \varepsilon a$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&c_3 \left(\frac{1}{((\varepsilon a - h)_+ + k)^2} + \frac{1}{k^2(1-\delta)|\log \varepsilon|} \right)^{-\nu_0/2} \left(\frac{1}{k} + \frac{h}{k^2} \right)^{\nu_0-1} \\
&= c_3 k \left(\frac{k^2}{(\varepsilon a - h + k)^2} + \frac{1}{(1-\delta)|\log \varepsilon|} \right)^{-\nu_0/2} \left(1 + \frac{h}{k} \right)^{\nu_0-1} \\
&\geq 2^{\nu_0-1} c_3 k \left(\frac{(\gamma \varepsilon a)^2}{(\varepsilon a)^2} + \gamma^2 \right)^{-\nu_0/2} = 2^{\nu_0/2-1} c_3 k \gamma^{-\nu_0} = 2k.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we deduce from (5.9) that $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{B_r} u \geq 2k - k = k \geq \varepsilon_0 a$, proving that (5.2) holds. The proof is complete. \square

We recall a Krylov-Safonov type covering lemma from [18, Lemma 3.8], which is originally due to [41, Lemma 7.2].

Lemma 5.4. *Let $x_0 \in M$ and $r > 0$. For a measurable set $E \subset B(x_0, r)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, define*

$$[E]_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{l \in (0, r)} \left\{ B(x, 5l) \cap B(x_0, r) : x \in B(x_0, r) \text{ and } \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, 5l))}{V(x, l)} > \varepsilon \right\}. \tag{5.10}$$

Then we have either (1) $[E]_\varepsilon = B(x_0, r)$ or (2) $\mu([E]_\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^{-1} \mu(E)$.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose that $\operatorname{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, $\operatorname{rFK}_\beta(s)$, $\operatorname{rCS}_\beta(s)$ and $\operatorname{rPI}_\beta(s)$ hold with K_1 . There exist constants $\delta, C > 0$ independent of s such that for any $x_0 \in M$, $R \in (0, R_0)$, $r \in (0, R/(20K_1 + 3))$, and any Borel function u that is bounded, non-negative and $-\mathcal{L}u \geq f$ in $B(x_0, R)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{V(x_0, r)} \int_{B(x_0, r)} u^\delta d\mu \right)^{1/\delta} \\
&\leq C \left[\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{B(x_0, r)} u + r^{\beta s} \left(\mathcal{T}(u_-, B(x_0, (10K_1 + 1)r), B(x_0, R - 2r)^c) + \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\operatorname{rWEHI}_\beta(s)$ holds.

Proof. Write $B_a := B(x_0, a)$ for $a > 0$ and let

$$h := (5/2)^{\beta s} r^{\beta s} \left(\mathcal{T}(u_-, B_{(10K_1+1)r}, B_{R-2r}^c) + \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \right).$$

By VD, there exists $c_1 \in (0, 1/2)$ such that

$$V(x, a) \geq 2c_1 V(x, 5a) \quad \text{for all } x \in M \text{ and } a > 0. \quad (5.11)$$

Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be the constant from Lemma 5.3, associated with the parameter $\delta = 1 - c_1$.

Let $b > 0$ be an arbitrary positive constant. Define for $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_n(b) &:= \{x \in B_r : u(x) \geq b\varepsilon_0^n - (1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h\}, \\ H_n(b) &:= \{(x, l) \in B_r \times (0, r) : \mu(E_n(b) \cap B(x, 5l)) > 2^{-1}V(x, l)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define $[E_n(b)]_{2^{-1}}$ as (5.10). By the definition, we have

$$[E_n(b)]_{2^{-1}} = \cup_{(x,l) \in H_n(b)} (B(x, 5l) \cap B_r) \subset \cup_{(x,l) \in H_n(b)} B(x, 5l). \quad (5.12)$$

We will prove at the end of this proof that

$$\mu(E_{n+1}(b)) \geq \mu([E_n(b)]_{2^{-1}}) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0. \quad (5.13)$$

Assume for the moment that (5.13) holds. Let $n_0 = n_0(b) \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$2^{-n_0}V(x_0, r) < \mu(E_0(b)) \leq 2^{-n_0+1}V(x_0, r). \quad (5.14)$$

Suppose that $\mu(E_{n_0}(b)) < V(x_0, r)$. Then by (5.13) and Lemma 5.4,

$$\mu(E_k(b)) \geq \mu([E_{k-1}(b)]_{2^{-1}}) \geq 2\mu(E_{k-1}(b)) \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq k \leq n_0,$$

and therefore, $V(x_0, r) > \mu(E_{n_0}(b)) \geq 2^{n_0}\mu(E_0(b)) > V(x_0, r)$. This gives a contradiction. Hence, $\mu(E_{n_0}(b)) = V(x_0, r)$. Using this in the first inequality below and (5.14) in the second, we obtain

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{B_r} u \geq b\varepsilon_0^{n_0} - (1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h \geq b \left(\frac{\mu(E_0(b))}{2V(x_0, r)} \right)^{|\log \varepsilon_0|/\log 2} - (1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h. \quad (5.15)$$

Set $\delta_1 := (\log 2)/|\log \varepsilon_0|$ and

$$K := \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{B_r} u + (1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h.$$

By (5.15), we get that for all $b > 0$,

$$\mu(\{x \in B_r : u(x) \geq b\}) \leq \mu(E_0(b)) \leq 2(K/b)^{\delta_1} V(x_0, r). \quad (5.16)$$

Using (5.16), we conclude that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{V(x_0, r)} \int_{B_r} u^\delta d\mu \\ &= \delta \int_0^\infty b^{\delta-1} \frac{\mu(\{x \in B_r : u(x) \geq b\})}{V(x_0, r)} db \leq \delta \int_0^K b^{\delta-1} db + 2\delta K^{\delta_1} \int_K^\infty b^{\delta-1-\delta_1} db = \frac{\delta_1 + \delta}{\delta_1 - \delta} K^\delta, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired result.

Now, we prove (5.13). Let $n \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. By the inner regularity of μ and (5.12), there exist a finite collection $\{B(x_i, 5l_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ with $(x_i, l_i) \in H_n(b)$ such that

$$\mu([E_n(b)]_{2^{-1}}) \leq \mu(\cup_{i=1}^N B(x_i, 5l_i)) + \varepsilon. \quad (5.17)$$

For all $1 \leq i \leq N$, using (5.11), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu(B(x_i, 5l_i) \cap \{u < b\varepsilon_0^n - (1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h\}) \\ & \leq \mu(B(x_i, 5l_i) \cap E_n^c) \leq V(x_i, 5l_i) - 2^{-1}V(x_i, l_i) \leq (1 - c_1)V(x_i, 5l_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, applying Lemma 5.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{B(x_i, 5l_i)} u & \geq \varepsilon_0(b\varepsilon_0^n - (1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h) - (5l_i)^{\beta s}(\mathcal{T}(u_-, B(x_i, 20K_1l_i), B(x_i, R - r)^c) + \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}) \\ & \geq b\varepsilon_0^{n+1} - \varepsilon_0(1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h - (5/2)^{\beta s}r^{\beta s}(\mathcal{T}(u_-, B_{(10K_1+1)r}, B_{R-2r}^c) + \|f_-\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}) \\ & \geq b\varepsilon_0^{n+1} - \varepsilon_0(1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h - h = b\varepsilon_0^{n+1} - (1 - \varepsilon_0)^{-1}h. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mu(\cup_{i=1}^N B(x_i, 5l_i) \setminus E_{n+1}(b)) = 0$. Combining this with (5.17), we arrive at

$$\mu([E_n(b)]_{2^{-1}}) \leq \mu(\cup_{i=1}^N B(x_i, 5l_i)) + \varepsilon \leq \mu(E_{n+1}(b)) + \varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrary positive constant, (5.13) holds true. The proof is complete. \square

5.2 $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s) + \text{rWEHI}_\beta(s) \Rightarrow \text{rEHR}_\beta(s)$

For an open set $D \subset M$ and $u \in L^\infty(D)$, define

$$\operatorname{ess\,osc}_D u := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_D u - \operatorname{ess\,inf}_D u.$$

By a standard argument, we establish the next oscillation inequality for weak solutions of the Poisson equation (1.8) under $\text{rWEHI}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$.

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose that $\text{rWEHI}_\beta(s)$ and $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$ hold. There exist constants $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ independent of s such that for any $x_0 \in M$, $0 < r \leq R < R_0$, and any Borel function u that is bounded in M and $-\mathcal{L}u = f$ in $B(x_0, R)$ for $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$,*

$$\operatorname{ess\,osc}_{B(x_0, r)} u \leq C \left((r/R)^\gamma \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} + R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, R))} \right).$$

Proof. Let $x_0 \in M$, $R \in (0, R_0)$ and $f \in L^\infty(B(x_0, R))$. Write $B_a := B(x_0, a)$ for $a > 0$. Let $K \geq 1$ be the constant in $\text{rWEHI}_\beta(s)$ and set $\varepsilon := 1/(3K + 2)$. Define

$$W_{-1} := M \quad \text{and} \quad W_n := B_{\varepsilon^n R} \quad \text{for } n \geq 0.$$

Let $\gamma \in (0, \beta s_0/2)$ be a constant to be determined later. In the following, we construct a non-increasing sequence $(b_n)_{n \geq -1}$ and a non-decreasing sequence $(a_n)_{n \geq -1}$ with the following properties: For all $n \geq -1$,

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{W_n} u \leq b_n + R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \varepsilon^{i\beta s}, \quad \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{W_n} u \geq a_n - R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \quad (5.18)$$

and

$$b_n - a_n = 2\varepsilon^{n\gamma} \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}. \quad (5.19)$$

Define $b_{-1} = b_0 = \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}$, $a_{-1} = -(2\varepsilon^{-\gamma} - 1)\|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}$ and $a_0 = -\|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}$. Then (5.18) and (5.19) hold for $n = -1, 0$.

Suppose that monotone sequences $(b_n)_{-1 \leq n \leq k}$ and $(a_n)_{-1 \leq n \leq k}$ are constructed to satisfy (5.18) and (5.19) for all $0 \leq n \leq k$, for some $k \geq 0$. Consider the function

$$v_k(x) := \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} \left(u(x) - \frac{a_k + b_k}{2} \right).$$

For all $0 \leq j \leq k+1$, using the induction hypothesis, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{W_{k-j}} v_k &\leq \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} \left(b_{k-j} - \frac{a_k + b_k}{2} \right) + \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k-j} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} \left(b_{k-j} - a_{k-j} - \frac{b_k - a_k}{2} \right) + \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k-j} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \\ &= (2\varepsilon^{-j\gamma} - 1) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k-j} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{W_{k-j}} v_k &\geq -\varepsilon^{-k\gamma} \left(-a_{k-j} + \frac{a_k + b_k}{2} \right) - \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k-j} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \\ &\geq -(2\varepsilon^{-j\gamma} - 1) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} - \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k-j} \varepsilon^{i\beta s}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

There are two cases.

Case 1: Suppose that $\mu(W_{k+1} \cap \{v_k \geq 0\}) \geq 2^{-1} \mu(W_{k+1})$. Consider

$$w_k := v_k + \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} \varepsilon^{i\beta s}.$$

By (5.21), $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{W_k} w_k \geq 0$. Further, we have $-\mathcal{L}w_k \geq -\varepsilon^{-k\gamma} |f|$ in W_k . Applying $\text{rWEHI}_\beta(s)$ (with R replaced by $\varepsilon^k R$ and r replaced by $\varepsilon^{k+1} R$) to w_k , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{1}{\mu(W_{k+1})} \int_{W_{k+1}} w_k^\delta d\mu \right)^{1/\delta} \\ &\leq c_1 \left(\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{W_{k+1}} w_k + (\varepsilon^{k+1} R)^{\beta s} \left[\mathcal{T}((w_k)_-, B_{K\varepsilon^{k+1}R}, B_{(1-2\varepsilon)\varepsilon^k R}^c) + \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

where c_1 and δ are positive constants independent of s, x_0, r, R, f, u and k . By the assumption $\mu(W_{k+1} \cap \{v_k \geq 0\}) \geq 2^{-1} \mu(W_{k+1})$, we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{\mu(W_{k+1})} \int_{W_{k+1}} w_k^\delta d\mu \right)^{1/\delta} \geq \left(\frac{1}{\mu(W_{k+1})} \int_{W_{k+1} \cap \{v_k \geq 0\}} w_k^\delta d\mu \right)^{1/\delta} \geq 2^{-1/\delta} \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}. \quad (5.23)$$

Moreover, since $K\varepsilon < 1/3$ and $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{W_k} w_k \geq 0$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{T}((w_k)_-, B_{K\varepsilon^{k+1}R}, B_{(1-2\varepsilon)\varepsilon^k R}^c) \\ &\leq \mathcal{T}((w_k)_-, B_{\varepsilon^k R/3}, W_k^c) = \sup_{x \in B_{\varepsilon^k R/3}} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \int_{W_{k-j} \setminus W_{k-j+1}} (w_k)_-(y) J(x, dy). \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

Let $x \in B_{\varepsilon^k R/3}$ and $1 \leq j \leq k+1$. Using (5.21) and $\text{rTJ}_\beta(s)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{W_{k-j} \setminus W_{k-j+1}} (w_k)_-(y) J(x, dy) &\leq 2(\varepsilon^{-j\gamma} - 1) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} J(x, W_{k-j+1}^c) \\ &\leq 2(\varepsilon^{-j\gamma} - 1) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} J(x, B(x, 2\varepsilon^{k-j+1} R/3)^c) \\ &\leq \frac{2\Lambda(1-s)(\varepsilon^{-j\gamma} - 1) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}}{(2\varepsilon^{k-j+1} R/3)^{\beta s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, from (5.24), using the inequality $a^b - 1 \leq ba^b \log a$ for $a > 1$ and $b > 0$ in the second inequality below, and $\gamma < \beta s_0/2$ and $\sup_{0 < a < 1} a^{\beta s_0/2} |\log a| < \infty$ in the fourth, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\varepsilon^{k+1} R)^{\beta s} \mathcal{T}((w_k)_-, B_{K\varepsilon^{k+1} R}, B_{(1-2\varepsilon)\varepsilon^k R}^c) &\leq \frac{2\Lambda(1-s) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}}{(2/3)^\beta} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \varepsilon^{j\beta s} (\varepsilon^{-j\gamma} - 1) \\ &\leq \frac{2\gamma\Lambda(1-s) |\log \varepsilon| \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}}{(2/3)^\beta} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j \varepsilon^{j(\beta s - \gamma)} \leq \frac{2\gamma\Lambda \varepsilon^{\beta s_0/2} |\log \varepsilon| \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}}{(2/3)^\beta (1 - \varepsilon^{\beta s_0/2})^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (5.22) and (5.23), we arrive at

$$\text{ess inf}_{W_{k+1}} w_k \geq \left(2^{-1/\delta} c_1^{-1} - \frac{2\gamma\Lambda \varepsilon^{\beta s_0/2} |\log \varepsilon|}{(2/3)^\beta (1 - \varepsilon^{\beta s_0/2})^2} \right) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} - \varepsilon^{(k+1)\beta s - k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}. \quad (5.25)$$

Now we choose $\gamma \in (0, \beta s_0/2)$ small enough to satisfy

$$2^{-1/\delta} c_1^{-1} - \frac{2\gamma\Lambda \varepsilon^{\beta s_0/2} |\log \varepsilon|}{(2/3)^\beta (1 - \varepsilon^{\beta s_0/2})^2} \geq 2^{-2/\delta} c_1^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad 2\varepsilon^\gamma \geq 2 - 2^{-2/\delta} c_1^{-1}.$$

Then, by (5.25), since $a_k = b_k - 2\varepsilon^{k\gamma} \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}$ by the induction hypothesis, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ess inf}_{W_{k+1}} u &= \frac{a_k + b_k}{2} + \varepsilon^{k\gamma} \text{ess inf}_{W_{k+1}} \left[w_k - \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} - \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \right] \\ &\geq \frac{a_k + b_k}{2} + \varepsilon^{k\gamma} \left[(2^{-2/\delta} c_1^{-1} - 1) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} - \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \left(\varepsilon^{(k+1)\beta s} + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \right) \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \right] \\ &\geq b_k - \varepsilon^{k\gamma} (2 - 2^{-2/\delta} c_1^{-1}) \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} - R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k+1} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \\ &\geq b_k - 2\varepsilon^{(k+1)\gamma} \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} - R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k+1} \varepsilon^{i\beta s}. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $b_{k+1} = b_k$ and $a_{k+1} = b_k - 2\varepsilon^{(k+1)\gamma} \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}$, we conclude that (5.18) and (5.19) hold for $k+1$.

Case 2: Suppose that $\mu(W_{k+1} \cap \{v_k \geq 0\}) < 2^{-1}\mu(W_{k+1})$. Define

$$\tilde{w}_k = -v_k + \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \varepsilon^{-k\gamma} R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} \varepsilon^{i\beta s}.$$

Following the argument for Case 1, using the function \tilde{w}_k instead of w_k and the inequality (5.20) instead of (5.21), one can deduce that (5.18) and (5.19) hold for $k+1$ with $a_{k+1} = a_k$ and $b_{k+1} = a_k + 2\varepsilon^{(k+1)\gamma} \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)}$.

By induction, we get monotone sequences $(b_n)_{n \geq -1}$ and $(a_n)_{n \geq -1}$ satisfying (5.18) and (5.19) for all $n \geq -1$. Consider any $r \in (0, R]$, and let $n_0 \geq 0$ be such that $\varepsilon^{n_0+1} < r/R \leq \varepsilon^{n_0}$. By (5.18) and (5.19), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{B_r} u &\leq \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{W_{n_0}} u \leq b_{n_0} - a_{n_0} + 2R^{\beta s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \sum_{i \geq 0} \varepsilon^{i\beta s} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^{n_0\gamma} \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \frac{2R^{\beta s}}{1 - \varepsilon^{\beta s}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq 2\varepsilon^{-\gamma} \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \frac{2R^{\beta s}}{1 - \varepsilon^{\beta s_0}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 5.7. *Suppose that $\operatorname{rWEH}_{\beta}(s)$ and $\operatorname{rTJ}_{\beta}(s)$ hold. Then $\operatorname{rEHR}_{\beta}(s)$ holds.*

Proof. For μ -a.e. $x, y \in B(x_0, R/4)$, we get from Proposition 5.6 that

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{B(x, 3d(x, y)/2)} u \leq c_1 \left(\frac{3d(x, y)/2}{3R/4} \right)^\gamma \|u\|_{L^\infty(M)},$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is the constant in Proposition 5.6. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.12. The result follows from Theorem 1.9, Proposition 5.5 and Corollary 5.7. \square

6 Proof of Theorem 1.14

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.14. Throughout this section, we assume that $J(dx, dy) = J(x, y)\mu(dx)\mu(dy)$ in $M \times M$ and (1.12) holds with R_0, δ_0, σ and θ . By VD, there exists $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$V(x, R) \leq \varepsilon_0 V(x, \frac{\delta_0}{5}R) \quad \text{for all } x \in M \text{ and } R > 0. \quad (6.1)$$

We begin with two lemmas about geometric properties of (M, d, μ) .

Lemma 6.1. *Let $x \in M$, $R > 0$ and E be a measurable set. If*

$$\mu(E \cap B(x, R)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0^2 a)V(x, R)$$

for some $a \in (0, 1)$, then for any $r \in (0, (1 - \delta_0/5)R]$, there exists $z \in B(x, R - r)$ such that

$$\mu(E \cap B(z, r)) \geq (1 - a)V(z, r).$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mu(E \cap B(z, r)) < (1 - a)V(z, r)$ for all $B(z, r) \subset B(x_0, R)$. By the Vitali covering lemma, there exists a collection $\{B(z_i, r)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of pairwise disjoint open balls with $z_i \in B(x_0, R - r)$ such that $B(x_0, R - r) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty B(z_i, 5r)$. By assumption, $\mu(E^c \cap B(z_i, r)) > aV(z_i, r)$ for all $i \geq 1$. Using this and (6.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(E^c \cap B(x_0, R)) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(E^c \cap B(z_i, r)) \\ &> a \sum_{i=1}^\infty V(z_i, r) \geq \varepsilon_0 a \sum_{i=1}^\infty V(z_i, 5r) \geq \varepsilon_0 a V(x_0, R - r) \geq \varepsilon_0^2 a V(x_0, R), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the assumption that $\mu(E \cap B(x, R)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0^2 a)V(x, R)$. \square

Lemma 6.2. *Let E be a measurable set. The function*

$$(x, r) \mapsto \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, r))}{V(x, r)}$$

is jointly continuous in $M \times (0, R_0)$.

Proof. Let $x \in M$ and $r \in (0, R_0)$. For any $(y, r') \in B(x, r/4) \times (r/2, R_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, r))}{V(x, r)} - \frac{\mu(E \cap B(y, r'))}{V(y, r')} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{V(y, r') |\mu(E \cap B(x, r)) - \mu(E \cap B(y, r'))| + \mu(E \cap B(y, r')) |V(y, r') - V(x, r)|}{V(x, r)V(y, r')} \\ & \leq \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, r \vee r' + d(x, y))) - \mu(E \cap B(x, r \wedge r' - d(x, y)))}{V(x, r)} \\ & \quad + \frac{V(x, r \vee r' + d(x, y)) - V(x, r \wedge r' - d(x, y))}{V(x, r)} \\ & \leq \frac{2(V(x, r \vee r' + d(x, y)) - V(x, r \wedge r' - d(x, y)))}{V(x, r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{(y, r') \rightarrow (x, r)} (V(x, r \vee r' + d(x, y)) - V(x, r \wedge r' - d(x, y))) = \mu(\{z \in M : d(x, z) = r\}) = 0$ by the outer regularity of μ and (1.11), the result follows. \square

We define $J_k(x, y)$ and $N_k(x)$ inductively as follows. Let $J_0(x, y) := J(x, y)$ and

$$N_0(x) := \left\{ z \in M : J_0(x, z) \geq \frac{\theta(1-s)}{V(x, d(x, z))d(x, z)^{\beta s}} \right\}.$$

Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be a constant to be determined later. Suppose that $J_k(x, y)$ and $N_k(x)$ are well-defined for some $k \geq 0$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} r_k(x, z) &:= \sup \left\{ r \geq 0 : r \leq \frac{\delta_0 d(x, z)}{10}, \exists w \in B(z, r) \text{ such that } \frac{\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w, r))}{V(w, r)} \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 \sigma}{2} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{J}_k(x, y, z) &:= \begin{cases} \frac{J_k(x, z)}{V(z, r_k(x, z))} \wedge \frac{d(y, z)^{\beta s} J(y, z)}{V(y, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta s}} & \text{if } r_k(x, z) > 0 \text{ and } y \in B(z, 4r_k(x, z)), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ is the constant in (6.1). Then we define

$$\begin{aligned} J_{k+1}(x, y) &= \int_{B(y, 2d(x, y))} \mathcal{J}_k(x, y, z) \mu(dz), \\ N_{k+1}(x) &= \left\{ z \in M : J_{k+1}(x, z) \geq \frac{\theta \lambda^k (1-s)}{V(x, d(x, z))d(x, z)^{\beta s}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.3. *For any $k \geq 0$, there exists $C > 0$ depending on k, s_0 and the constants in VD only such that for any ball $B(x_0, R)$ and a function $f : B(x_0, R) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, R) \times B(x_0, R)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ & \geq C \int_{B(x_0, 5^{-k}R) \times B(x_0, 5^{-k}R)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_k(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy). \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

Proof. Write $aB := B(x_0, aR)$ for $a > 0$. Clearly, (6.2) holds for $k = 0$. Suppose that (6.2) holds for $k - 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{5^{-k}B \times 5^{-k}B} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_k(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
& \leq 2 \int_{5^{-k}B \times 5^{-k}B} \int_{B(y, 2d(x, y))} ((f(x) - f(z))^2 + (f(y) - f(z))^2) \mathcal{J}_{k-1}(x, y, z) \mu(dz) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
& \leq 2 \int_{5^{-k}B \times 5^{-k}B} \int_{B(y, 2d(x, y))} (f(x) - f(z))^2 \frac{J_{k-1}(x, z)}{V(z, r_{k-1}(x, z))} \mathbf{1}_{B(z, 4r_{k-1}(x, z))}(y) \mu(dz) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
& \quad + 2 \int_{5^{-k}B \times 5^{-k}B} \int_{B(y, 2d(x, y))} (f(y) - f(z))^2 \frac{d(y, z)^{\beta s} J(y, z)}{V(y, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dz) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
& =: 2(I_1 + I_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Fubini's theorem, VD and the induction hypothesis, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 & \leq \int_{5^{-k}B \times 5^{1-k}B} (f(x) - f(z))^2 J_{k-1}(x, z) \frac{V(z, 4r_{k-1}(x, z))}{V(z, r_{k-1}(x, z))} \mu(dx) \mu(dz) \\
& \leq c_1 \int_{5^{1-k}B \times 5^{1-k}B} (f(x) - f(z))^2 J_{k-1}(x, z) \mu(dx) \mu(dz) \\
& \leq c_2 \int_{B \times B} (f(x) - f(z))^2 J(x, z) \mu(dx) \mu(dz).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Further, using Fubini's theorem and Lemma 2.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 & \leq \int_{5^{-k}B \times 5^{1-k}B} (f(y) - f(z))^2 d(y, z)^{\beta s} J(y, z) \int_{B(y, d(y, z)/2)^c} \frac{\mu(dx)}{V(y, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}} \mu(dy) \mu(dz) \\
& \leq \frac{c_3}{\beta s_0} \int_{5^{-k}B \times 5^{1-k}B} (f(y) - f(z))^2 J(y, z) \mu(dy) \mu(dz).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (6.3), we arrive at the result by induction. \square

For the proof of the next lemma, we adapt the argument from [15, Lemma 4.2]. However, there was a gap in the last display of their proof: in their notation, the set Ξ may not be contained in $\Omega_j(x, y)$. Using Lemma 6.1, we address this issue.

Lemma 6.4. *There exists $c_0 \in (0, 1]$ depending on δ_0, σ and the constants in VD only such that if $\lambda \leq c_0$, then for all $x \in M$ and $k \geq 0$,*

$$\{z \in B(x, 2R_0) : r_k(x, z) > 0\} \subset N_{k+1}(x).$$

Proof. Let $y \in B(x, 2R_0)$ be such that $r_k(x, y) > 0$. We prove that there exists $c_0 \in (0, 1]$ depending on δ_0, σ and the constants in VD only such that

$$J_{k+1}(x, y) \geq \frac{c_0 \theta \lambda^k (1 - s)}{V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}}. \tag{6.4}$$

This yields the desired result.

Set $v_0 := y$. Since $r_k(x, v_0) > 0$, there exists $w_0 \in B(v_0, r_k(x, v_0))$ such that $\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w_0, r_k(x, v_0))) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0^2 \sigma / 2) V(w_0, r_k(x, v_0))$. We construct sequences $(v_j)_{j \geq 0}$ and $(w_j)_{j \geq 0}$ as follows: Set

$$\varepsilon := \frac{3\delta_0 - \delta_0^2}{5} \quad \text{and} \quad K := 1 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon}.$$

If there exists $v_j \in B(w_{j-1}, r_k(x, v_{j-1}))$ with $r_k(x, v_j) > Kr_k(x, v_{j-1})$, select such v_j . Since $r_k(x, v_j) > 0$, there is $w_j \in B(v_j, r_k(x, v_j))$ such that

$$\frac{\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w_j, r_k(x, v_j)))}{V(w_j, r_k(x, v_j))} \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 \sigma}{2}. \quad (6.5)$$

If v_j is well-defined, then

$$\begin{aligned} d(y, v_j) &\leq d(y, v_{j-1}) + d(v_{j-1}, w_{j-1}) + d(w_{j-1}, v_j) < d(y, v_{j-1}) + 2r_k(x, v_{j-1}) \\ &\leq \cdots \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} r_k(x, v_i) \leq 2r_k(x, v_j) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K^{-i} = \varepsilon r_k(x, v_j). \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

In particular, we have $10d(y, v_j) < 10r_k(x, v_j) < d(x, v_j) \leq d(y, v_j) + d(x, y)$ which implies

$$10r_k(x, v_j) < d(x, v_j) < \frac{10}{9}d(x, y). \quad (6.7)$$

Since $r_k(x, v_j) > K^j r_k(x, v_0)$ whenever v_j is well-defined, the iterative construction stops after n steps for some $n < \infty$.

By (6.5) and Lemma 6.1, there exists $w'_n \in B(w_n, (\delta_0/5)r_k(x, v_n))$ such that

$$\frac{\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w'_n, (1 - \delta_0/5)r_k(x, v_n)))}{V(w'_n, (1 - \delta_0/5)r_k(x, v_n))} \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma}{2}. \quad (6.8)$$

By (6.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(y, w'_n) &\leq d(y, v_n) + d(v_n, w_n) + d(w_n, w'_n) \\ &< (1 + \varepsilon + \delta_0/5) r_k(x, v_n) = (1 + \delta_0) (1 - \delta_0/5) r_k(x, v_n). \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

Further, by (6.7), $(1 - \delta_0/5)r_k(x, v_n) < R_0$. Set $A := B(w'_n, (1 - \delta_0/5)r_k(x, v_n))$. Using (6.8), (6.9) and (1.12), we get

$$\mu(N_k(x) \cap N_0(y) \cap A) \geq \mu(N_k(x) \cap A) + \mu(N_0(y) \cap A) - \mu(A) \geq \frac{\sigma}{2} \mu(A). \quad (6.10)$$

For any $z \in A$, we have $r_k(x, z) \leq Kr_k(x, v_n)$ by the maximality of n ,

$$d(x, z) \leq d(x, v_n) + d(v_n, w_n) + d(w_n, z) \leq d(x, v_n) + 2r_k(x, v_n) \leq \frac{11d(x, y)}{9}$$

by (6.7) and

$$d(y, z) \leq d(y, w'_n) + d(w'_n, z) < (2 + \delta_0) \left(1 - \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) r_k(x, v_n) \quad (6.11)$$

by (6.9). Thus, for any $z \in A \cap N_k(x) \cap N_0(y)$, using VD*, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{J_k(x, z)}{V(z, r_k(x, z))} &\geq \frac{\theta \lambda^k (1 - s)}{V(x, d(x, z)) d(x, z)^{\beta s} V(z, Kr_k(x, v_n))} \\ &\geq \frac{c_1 \theta \lambda^k (1 - s)}{V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s} V(w_n, r_k(x, v_n))} \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(y, z)^{\beta s} J(y, z)}{V(y, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}} &\geq \frac{\theta (1 - s)}{V(y, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s} V(y, (2 + \delta_0)(1 - \delta_0/5)r_k(x, v_n))} \\ &\geq \frac{c_2 \theta (1 - s)}{V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s} V(w_n, r_k(x, v_n))}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

Moreover, for any $z \in A$, since

$$\frac{\delta_0 d(x, z)}{10} \geq \frac{\delta_0}{10} (d(x, v_n) - d(v_n, w_n) - d(w_n, z)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) r_k(x, v_n),$$

we deduce from (6.8) and (6.11) that

$$r_k(x, z) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) r_k(x, v_n) > \frac{d(y, z)}{2 + \delta_0} \geq \frac{d(y, z)}{4}. \quad (6.14)$$

Combining (6.10), (6.12), (6.13) and (6.14), and using VD*, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} J_{k+1}(x, y) &\geq \int_{A \cap N_k(x) \cap N_0(y)} \mathcal{J}_k(x, y, z) \mu(dz) \\ &\geq \frac{(c_1 \wedge c_2) \theta \lambda^k (1-s)}{V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s} V(w_n, r_k(x, v_n))} \int_{A \cap N_k(x) \cap N_0(y)} \mu(dz) \\ &\geq \frac{\sigma(c_1 \wedge c_2) \theta \lambda^k (1-s) \mu(A)}{2V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s} V(w_n, r_k(x, v_n))} \geq \frac{c_3 \theta \lambda^k (1-s)}{V(x, d(x, y)) d(x, y)^{\beta s}}, \end{aligned}$$

proving that (6.4) holds. The proof is complete. \square

In the remainder of this section, we let $\lambda = c_0$ where c_0 is the constant in Lemma 6.4.

Lemma 6.5. *For all $x \in M$ and $k \geq 0$, we have $\mu((N_{k+1}(x) \setminus N_k(x)) \cap B(x, 2R_0)) = 0$.*

Proof. By Lebesgue's differentiation theorem (see [35, Theorem 1.8]), for μ -a.e. $y \in N_k(x)$, we have $R_k(x, y) > 0$. The result follows from Lemma 6.4. \square

The proof below is based on that of [15, Proposition 4.3], with some non-trivial modifications needed since M is not geodesic in general.

Lemma 6.6. *There exists $a_0 \in (0, 1)$ depending on δ_0, σ and the constants in VD only such that the following holds: Let $x \in M$ and $z \in B(x, R_0)$. Set $R := d(x, z)/(1 + \delta_0)$. For all $k \geq 0$, we have either*

$$B(z, R) \subset N_{k+1}(x) \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\mu((N_{k+1}(x) \setminus N_k(x)) \cap B(z, 2R))}{V(z, 2R)} \geq a_0.$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.5, (1.12) and VD, we have

$$\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(z, R)) \geq \mu(N_0(x) \cap B(z, R)) \geq \sigma V(z, R) \geq c_1 V(z, 2R). \quad (6.15)$$

Set $\sigma' := \varepsilon_0^4 \sigma / 2$ where ε_0 is the constant in (6.1). We deal with two cases separately.

Case 1: $\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(z, R)) < (1 - \sigma') V(z, R)$.

Let $y \in N_k(x) \cap B(z, R)$ be a Lebesgue point of $\mathbf{1}_{N_k(x)}$. Then there is $l^y \in (0, R - d(z, y))$ such that $\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(y, l^y)) \geq (1 - \sigma') V(y, l^y)$. Define

$$\mathcal{A}^y := \left\{ (w, r) \in \overline{B(z, R - l^y)} \times [l_y, \infty) : d(y, w) + l^y \leq r \leq R - d(z, w) \right\}$$

and $\mathcal{A}_0^y := \{(w, r) \in \mathcal{V}^y : \mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w, r)) \geq (1 - \sigma') V(w, r)\}$. We have $(y, l^y) \in \mathcal{A}_0^y$ and $(z, R) \in \mathcal{A}^y \setminus \mathcal{A}_0^y$. Note that \mathcal{A}^y is compact. Thus, by Lemma 6.2 and the intermediate value theorem, there exists $(w^y, r^y) \in \mathcal{A}_0^y$ such that

$$\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w^y, r^y)) = (1 - \sigma') V(w^y, r^y). \quad (6.16)$$

Note that $B(w^y, r^y) \subset B(z, R)$. We claim that there exists $c_2 > 0$ depending on δ_0, σ and the constants in VD only such that

$$\mu((N_{k+1}(x) \setminus N_k(x)) \cap B(w^y, 2r^y)) \geq c_2 V(w^y, 2r^y). \quad (6.17)$$

To prove (6.17), we consider the following three subcases separately:

(i) Assume $r^y \leq \delta_0 d(x, w^y)/11$. For any $v \in B(w^y, r^y)$, we have $r^y \leq \delta_0 d(x, v)/10$. Hence, by (6.16), $r_k(x, v) > 0$ for all $v \in B(w^y, r^y)$. By Lemma 6.4, this implies $B(w^y, r^y) \subset N_{k+1}(x)$. Thus, using (6.16) and VD, we get

$$\mu((N_{k+1}(x) \setminus N_k(x)) \cap B(w^y, 2r^y)) \geq \mu(B(w^y, r^y) \setminus N_k(x)) = \sigma' V(w^y, r^y) \geq c_3 V(w^y, 2r^y). \quad (6.18)$$

(ii) Assume $r^y > \delta_0 d(x, w^y)/11$ and there is a covering $\{B(w_i, r_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of $B(w^y, r^y)$ with balls such that for all $i \geq 1$,

$$r_i \leq \frac{\delta_0^3}{132} d(x, w_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w_i, r_i)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0^2 \sigma/2) V(w_i, r_i).$$

By Lemma 6.4, we see $B(w_i, r_i) \subset N_{k+1}(x)$ for all $i \geq 1$. Hence, $B(w^y, r^y) \subset \cup_{i=1}^\infty B(w_i, r_i) \subset N_{k+1}(x)$ and (6.18) remains valid.

(iii) Assume $r^y > \delta_0 d(x, w^y)/11$ and there is no covering as in (ii). Then there exists $B(w_0, r_0)$ with $w_0 \in B(w^y, r^y)$ and $r_0 := \delta_0^3 d(x, w_0)/132$ such that $\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w_0, r_0)) < (1 - \varepsilon_0^2 \sigma/2) V(w_0, r_0)$. Note that

$$r_0 \leq \frac{\delta_0^3}{132} (d(x, w^y) + r^y) < \frac{\delta_0^2}{11} r^y. \quad (6.19)$$

By Lemma 6.1 and (6.16), there exists $w'_0 \in B(w^y, r^y)$ such that $\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w'_0, r_0)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0^2 \sigma/2) V(w_0, r_0)$. By the continuity of $w \mapsto \mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w, r_0))/V(w, r_0)$, we deduce that there exists $v_0 \in \overline{B(w^y, r^y)}$ such that $\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(v_0, r_0)) = (1 - \varepsilon_0^2 \sigma/2) V(v_0, r_0)$. Since

$$\frac{\delta_0}{11} d(x, v_0) \geq \frac{\delta_0}{11} (d(x, z) - d(z, v_0)) \geq \frac{\delta_0^2}{11} R \geq \frac{\delta_0^2}{11} r^y > r_0$$

by (6.19), we have $r_k(x, v) > 0$ for all $v \in B(v_0, r_0)$. Applying Lemma 6.4, we get $B(v_0, r_0) \subset N_{k+1}(x) \cap B(w^y, 2r^y)$. Note that

$$r_0 \geq \frac{\delta_0^3}{132} (d(x, z) - d(z, w_0)) \geq \frac{\delta_0^4}{132} R \geq \frac{\delta_0^4}{132} d(w^y, v_0).$$

Hence, by VD*, we get $V(v_0, r_0) \geq c_3 V(w^y, 2r^y)$. It follows that

$$\mu((N_{k+1}(x) \setminus N_k(x)) \cap B(w^y, 2r^y)) \geq \mu(B(v_0, r_0) \setminus N_k(x)) = \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 \sigma}{2} V(v_0, r_0) \geq \frac{c_4 \varepsilon_0^2 \sigma}{2} V(w^y, 2r^y).$$

The proof of (6.17) is complete. By Lebesgue's differentiation theorem, almost every point of $N_k(x) \cap B(z, R)$ is a Lebesgue point of $\mathbf{1}_{N_k(x)}$. By the Vitali covering lemma, there exists a collection $\{B(w^{y_i}, 2r^{y_i})\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of pairwise disjoint open balls with $y_i \in N_k(x) \cap B(z, R)$ such that $N_k(x) \cap B(z, R) \subset \cup_{i=1}^\infty B(w^{y_i}, 10r^{y_i})$ μ -a.e. Using (6.17), VD and (6.15), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mu((N_{k+1}(x) \setminus N_k(x)) \cap B(z, 2R)) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu((N_{k+1}(x) \setminus N_k(x)) \cap B(w^{y_i}, 2r^{y_i})) \\ &\geq c_1 \sum_{i=1}^\infty V(w^{y_i}, 2r^{y_i}) \geq c_5 \sum_{i=1}^\infty V(w^{y_i}, 10r^{y_i}) \geq c_5 \mu(N_k(x) \cap B(z, R)) \geq c_1 c_2 V(z, 2R). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(z, R)) \geq (1 - \sigma')V(z, R)$. If there exists a covering $\{B(w_i, r_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of $B(z, R)$ with balls such that

$$r_i \leq \frac{\delta_0^3}{132}d(x, w_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(N_k(x) \cap B(w_i, r_i)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0^2\sigma/2)V(w_i, r_i) \quad \text{for all } i \geq 1,$$

then, by Lemma 6.4, we obtain $B(z, R) \subset \cup_{i=1}^\infty B(w_i, r_i) \subset N_{k+1}(x)$. If no such covering of $B(z, R)$ exists, we can apply the argument from Case 1(iii) to deduce that there exist $v_0 \in \overline{B(z, R)}$ and $\delta_0^4 R/132 \leq r_0 < \delta_0 d(x, v_0)/11$ such that $\mu(N_k(x) \cap B(v_0, r_0)) = (1 - \varepsilon_0^2\sigma/2)V(v_0, r_0)$. Using VD*, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu((N_{k+1}(x) \setminus N_k(x)) \cap B(z, 2R)) \\ & \geq \mu(B(v_0, r_0) \setminus N_k(x)) = \frac{\varepsilon_0^2\sigma}{2}V(v_0, r_0) \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0^2\sigma}{2}V(v_0, \delta_0^4 R/132) \geq c_5 V(z, 2R). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Let $n_0 \geq 3$ be the smallest natural number such that

$$a_0(n_0 - 1) > 1 \tag{6.20}$$

where $a_0 \in (0, 1)$ is the constant in Lemma 6.6.

Corollary 6.7. *For all $x \in M$, we have $B(x, R_0) \subset N_{n_0}(x)$ μ -a.e.*

Proof. Let $z \in B(x, R_0)$ and set $R := d(x, z)/(1 + \delta_0)$. If $\mu(N_{n_0}(x) \cap B(z, R)) < V(z, R)$, then by Lemmas 6.5 and 6.6, and (6.20), we get

$$V(z, 2R) \geq \mu(N_{n_0}(x) \cap B(z, 2R)) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} \mu((N_{i+1}(x) - N_i(x)) \cap B(z, 2R)) \geq \frac{n_0}{n_0 - 1} V(z, 2R),$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, we get $B(z, R) \subset N_{n_0}(x)$ μ -a.e., implying the desired result. \square

Now we present the proof of Theorem 1.14.

Proof of Theorem 1.14. Let $x_0 \in M$, $r \in (0, R_0)$ and $f \in L^2(B(x_0, r))$. Using Lemma 6.3 and Corollary 6.7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, r) \times B(x_0, r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ & \geq c_1^{n_0} \int_{B(x_0, 5^{-n_0}r) \times B(x_0, 5^{-n_0}r)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_{n_0}(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ & = c_1^{n_0} \int_{B(x_0, 5^{-n_0}r)} \int_{B(x_0, 5^{-n_0}r) \cap B(x, 2 \cdot 5^{-n_0}r) \cap N_{n_0}(x)} (f(x) - f(y))^2 J_{n_0}(x, y) \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \\ & \geq c_1^{n_0} \theta \lambda^{n_0} (1 - s) \int_{B(x_0, 5^{-n_0}r) \times B(x_0, 5^{-n_0}r)} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))^2}{V(x, d(x, y))d(x, y)^{\beta_s}} \mu(dx) \mu(dy), \end{aligned}$$

proving that $\text{rEC}_\beta(s)$ holds with $K_0 = 5^{n_0}$. \square

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

- [1] S. Andres, M. T. Barlow, Energy inequalities for cutoff functions and some applications. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **699** (2015) 183–215.
- [2] M. T. Barlow, Diffusions on fractals. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1995)*, volume 1690 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pp. 1–121. Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [3] M. T. Barlow, Heat kernels and sets with fractal structure. In *Heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs, and metric spaces (Paris, 2002)*, volume 338 of *Comtemp. Math.*, pp. 11–40. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
- [4] M. T. Barlow, R. F. Bass, T. Kumagai, Stability of parabolic Harnack inequalities on metric measure spaces. *J. Math. Soc. Japan.* **58**(2) (2006), 485–519.
- [5] M. T. Barlow, A. Grigor’yan, T. Kumagai, On the equivalence of parabolic Harnack inequalities and heat kernel estimates. *J. Math. Soc. Japan.* **64**(4) (2012) 1091–1146.
- [6] R. F. Bass, Z.-Q. Chen, Regularity of harmonic functions for a class of singular stable-like processes. *Math. Z.* **266**(3) (2010) 489–503.
- [7] R. F. Bass, M. Kassmann, Hölder continuity of harmonic functions with respect to operators of variable order. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations.* **30**(7-9) (2005) 1249–1259.
- [8] R. F. Bass, D. A. Levin, Harnack inequalities for jump processes. *Potential Anal.* **17**(4) (2002) 375–388.
- [9] A. Bendikov, A. Grigor’yan, E. Hu, J. Hu, Heat kernels and non-local Dirichlet forms on ultrametric spaces. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5).* **22**(1) (2021) 399–461.
- [10] K. Bogdan, A. Stós, P. Sztonyk, Harnack inequality for stable processes on d -sets. *Studia Math.* **158**(2) (2003) 163–198.
- [11] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis, P. Mironescu, Limiting embedding theorems for $W^{s,p}$ when $s \uparrow 1$ and applications. *J. Anal. Math.* **87** (2002) 77–101.
- [12] S. M. Buckley, Is the maximal function of a Lipschitz function continuous?. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **24** (1999), no.2, 519–528.
- [13] K.-U. Bux, M. Kassmann, T. Schulze, Quadratic forms and Sobolev spaces of fractional order. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **119**(3) (2019) 841–866.
- [14] L. Caffarelli, L. Silvestre, The Evans-Krylov theorem for nonlocal fully nonlinear equations. *Ann. of Math.* **174**(2) (2011) 1163–1187.
- [15] J. Chaker, L. Silvestre, Coercivity estimates for integro-differential operators. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations.* **59**(4) (2020) Paper No. 106, 20.
- [16] Z.-Q. Chen, M. Fukushima, Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [17] Z.-Q. Chen, T. Kumagai, Heat kernel estimates for stable-like processes on d -sets. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **108**(1) (2003) 27–62.
- [18] Z.-Q. Chen, T. Kumagai, J. Wang, Elliptic Harnack inequalities for symmetric non-local Dirichlet forms. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **125** (2019) 1–42.
- [19] Z.-Q. Chen, T. Kumagai, J. Wang, Heat kernel estimates and parabolic Harnack inequalities for symmetric Dirichlet forms. *Adv. Math.* **374** (2020) 107269, 71.
- [20] Z.-Q. Chen, T. Kumagai, J. Wang, Stability of parabolic Harnack inequalities for symmetric non-local Dirichlet forms. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS).* **22**(11) (2020) 3747–3803.
- [21] Z.-Q. Chen, T. Kumagai, J. Wang, Stability of heat kernel estimates for symmetric non-local Dirichlet forms. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **271** (2021) v+89.
- [22] S. Cho, P. Kim, Estimates on the tail probabilities of subordinators and applications to general time fractional equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **130**(7) (2020) 4392–4443.

- [23] A. Di Castro, T. Kuusi, G. Palatucci, Nonlocal Harnack inequalities. *J. Funct. Anal.* **267**(6) (2014) 1807–1836.
- [24] B. Dyda, M. Kassmann, Regularity estimates for elliptic nonlocal operators. *Anal. PDE.* **13**(2) (2020) 317–370.
- [25] M. Felsinger, M. Kassmann, Local regularity for parabolic nonlocal operators. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations.* **38**(9) (2013) 1539–1573.
- [26] P. J. Fitzsimmons, B. M. Hambly, T. Kumagai, Transition density estimates for Brownian motion on affine nested fractals. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **165**(3) (1994) 595–620.
- [27] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, M. Takeda, Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2011.
- [28] A. Grigor’yan, The heat equation on noncompact Riemannian manifolds. *Mat. Sb.* **182**(1) (1991) 55–87.
- [29] A. Grigor’yan, E. Hu, J. Hu, Two-sided estimates of heat kernels of jump type Dirichlet forms. *Adv. Math.* **330** (2018) 433–515.
- [30] A. Grigor’yan, E. Hu, J. Hu, The pointwise existence and properties of heat kernel. In *Analysis and partial differential equations on manifolds, fractals and graphs*, volume 3 of *Adv. Anal. Geom.*, pp. 27–69. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2021.
- [31] A. Grigor’yan, E. Hu, J. Hu, Mean value inequality and generalized capacity on doubling spaces. *Pure Appl. Funct. Anal.* **9**(1) (2024) 111–168.
- [32] A. Grigor’yan, J. Hu, Heat kernels and Green functions on metric measure spaces. *Canad. J. Math.* **66**(3) (2014) 641–699.
- [33] A. Grigor’yan, J. Hu, K.-S. Lau, Generalized capacity, Harnack inequality and heat kernels of Dirichlet forms on metric measure spaces. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **67**(4) (2015) 1485–1549.
- [34] N. Guillen, R. W. Schwab, Aleksandrov-Bakelman-Pucci type estimates for integro-differential equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **206**(1) (2012) 111–157.
- [35] J. Heinonen, Lectures on analysis on metric spaces. Universitext Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [36] N. C. Jain, W. E. Pruitt, Lower tail probability estimates for subordinators and nondecreasing random walks. *Ann. Probab.* **15**(1) (1987) 75–101.
- [37] N. Kajino, M. Murugan, On the conformal walk dimension: quasisymmetric uniformization for symmetric diffusions. *Invent. Math.* **231**(1) (2023) 263–405.
- [38] M. Kassmann, A priori estimates for integro-differential operators with measurable kernels. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations.* **34**(1) (2009) 1–21.
- [39] J. Kigami, Analysis on fractals, volume 143 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [40] J. Kigami, Volume doubling measures and heat kernel estimates on self-similar sets. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **199** (2009) viii+94.
- [41] J. Kinnunen, N. Shanmugalingam, Regularity of quasi-minimizers on metric spaces. *Manuscripta Math.* **105**(3) (2001) 401–423.
- [42] S. Kusuoka, D. Stroock, Applications of the Malliavin calculus. III. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **34**(2) (1987) 391–442.
- [43] P. Li, S.-T. Yau, On the parabolic kernel of the Schrödinger operator. *Acta Math.* **156**(3-4) (1986) 153–201.
- [44] V. Maz’ya, T. Shaposhnikova, On the Bourgain, Brezis, and Mironescu theorem concerning limiting embeddings of fractional Sobolev spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.* **195**(2) (2002) 230–238.
- [45] V. Maz’ya, T. Shaposhnikova, Erratum to: “On the Bourgain, Brezis and Mironescu theorem concerning limiting embeddings of fractional Sobolev spaces” [*J. Funct. Anal.* **195** (2002), no. 2, 230–238]. *J. Funct. Anal.* **201**(1) (2003) 298–300.

- [46] M. Murugan, On the length of chains in a metric space. *J. Funct. Anal.* **279**(6) (2020) 108627, 18.
- [47] H. Ôkura, Recurrence and transience criteria for subordinated symmetric Markov processes. *Forum Math.* **14**(1) (2002) 121–146.
- [48] X. Ros-Oton, J. Serra, Regularity theory for general stable operators. *J. Differential Equations* **260**(12) (2016) 8675–8715.
- [49] L. Saloff-Coste, A note on Poincaré, Sobolev, and Harnack inequalities. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices.* **2** (1992) 27–38.
- [50] R. L. Schilling, R. Song, Z. Vondraček, Bernstein functions: Theory and applications. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2012.
- [51] L. Silvestre, Hölder estimates for solutions of integro-differential equations like the fractional Laplace. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **55**(3) (2006) 1155–1174.
- [52] R. Song, Z. Vondraček, On the relationship between subordinate killed and killed subordinate processes. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **13** (2008) 325–336.

Soobin Cho: Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, U.S.A. Email: soobinc@illinois.edu